

JPRS 84184

24 August 1983

USSR Report

WORLD ECONOMY AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

No. 5, May 1983

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semimonthly by the NTIS, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

Soviet books and journal articles displaying a copyright notice are reproduced and sold by NTIS with permission of the copyright agency of the Soviet Union. Permission for further reproduction must be obtained from copyright owner.

24 August 1983

USSR REPORT

WORLD ECONOMY AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

No 5, May 1983

Translation of the Russian-language monthly journal MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA published in Moscow by the Institute of World Economy and International Relations, USSR Academy of Sciences.

CONTENTS

English Summaries of Major Articles in 'MEMO' Journal (pp 158-159).....	1
Zagladin Lauds Engels' Friendship, Collaboration With Marx (pp 4-20) (V. Zagladin).....	4
Relevance of Marxism to Contemporary Social Processes Defended (pp 21-36) (A. Galkin).....	26
U.S. 'Psychological Warfare' Against USSR Assailed (pp 37-48) (G. Sogomonyan).....	37
Soviet, U.S. Stands on Nonuse of Nuclear Arms Contrasted (pp 49-59) (V. Petrovskiy).....	47
Development Trends of the Capitalist Gold Market (pp 60-69) (A. Khandruev) (not translated)	
Internal Changes in Developing Countries Required for Economic Progress (pp 70-83) (I. Yegorov).....	56
OUR COMMENTARIES	
Britain in the Common Market (pp 84-89) (V. Zuyev) (not translated)	
CRITIQUE OF BOURGEOIS THEORIES	
Imperialist Prescriptions for the Emerging States (pp 90-103) (I. Aleshina) (not translated)	

ROUNDUPS, INFORMATION

New Phenomena in the Monopolization of U.S. Industry (pp 104-110)
(I. Razumnova) (not translated)

Singularities of French Investment in Latin America (pp 111-116)
(G. Bashirova) (not translated)

The Food Problem in the Developing World and the United Nations (pp 117-123)
(Yu. Kimak) (not translated)

WE ANSWER READERS' QUESTIONS

Consensus--Decision-Making Method in Multilateral Diplomacy (pp 124-132)
(Yu. Barsegov) (not translated)

BOOKS, AUTHORS

Primakov Reviews Gromyko Book on Export of Capital (pp 133-136)
(A.A. Gromyko)..... 72

Bagramov Book on Nationalism Reviewed (pp 137-138)
(A. Kholmogorov)..... 78

V. Iordanskiy Review "Pretoria's Expansionist Course" of "South Africa's
Policy in Africa" (pp 139-140)
(A.Yu. Urnov) (not translated)

Yu. Levin Review "The Capitalist Countries' Energy Prospects" of
"Energies: le grand tournant" (pp 141-142)
(Jean-Charles Dubart) (not translated)

I. Vaydere Review "Problems of Change in the FRG's Economic Structure"
of "Analyse der strukturellen Entwicklung der deutschen
Wirtschaft: Strukturbericht 1980" (pp 143-144) (not translated)

O. Sukhovtseva Review "The Currency Mechanism and the Emerging Countries"
of "Le franc CFA face aux mutations des grandes unites de compte:
dollar-DTS-ECU" (pp 145-147)
(Jean Nkuete) (not translated)

STATISTICS

Transport of the Developed Capitalist Countries" (p 148) (not translated)

In Remembrance of Donald Donaldovich Maclean (p 157) (not translated)

PUBLICATION DATA

English title	: WORLD ECONOMY AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS No 5, May 1983
Russian title	: MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA
Author (s)	:
Editor (s)	: Ya. S. Khavinson
Publishing House	: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda"
Place of Publication	: Moscow
Date of Publication	: May 1983
Signed to press	: 16 April 1983
Copies	: 30,000
COPYRIGHT	: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1983.

ENGLISH SUMMARIES OF MAJOR ARTICLES IN 'MEMO' JOURNAL

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 5,
May 83 pp 158-159

[Text] V. Zagladin's article "Communion of Giants" is dedicated to the close working cooperation of K. Marx and F. Engels in theory and practice. The author analyzes their scientific activity. Marx's and Engel's indissoluble ties are not simply a historical fact but a historical phenomenon of tremendous importance. Next to the names of Marx and Engels stands the name of their genius successor V.I. Lenin which with particular vigor stresses the continuity and unity of the great revolutionary teaching. V.I. Lenin raised Marxism to a new historical level, discovered the law-governed nature of revolutionary transition from capitalism to socialism, to a new epoch. While analyzing the creative legacy of the three Giants of humanity the author maintains that comprehensive study of Marx's and Engels's idea and deeds combined with those of Lenin's is an inalienable part of present-day revolutionary practice, one of the decisive preconditions for subsequent social transformation of human society. Marxism-Leninism as a whole has become the lofty synthesis of the conception of the three Giants of humanity. At present mighty forces of the revolutionary working class movement are manifesting themselves on the arena of world history. The article draws the main conclusion that the forces of the new world, the forces of the future by developing and deepening the theory created by Marx, Engels and Lenin and drawing on their experience are translating into practice the behests of their great teachers.

A. Galkin in the article "K. Marx on the World-historic Mission of the Proletariat" considers the Marxist-Leninist teaching on the World-historic mission of the proletariat as the gravedigger of the old bourgeois society and the creator of a new socialist one. The author shows that the teaching created by Marx as far back as the time of emergence of the proletariat, of its transformation from a "class in itself" into a "class for itself" has splendidly stood the test of time and been fully confirmed by practice. Great attention is paid to V.I. Lenin's role in elaborating the teaching about the world-historic mission of the proletariat, the strategy and tactics of its struggle aimed at the practical realization of its social predestination. The author exposes the bourgeois ideologists' attempts who try to prove that the Marxist-Leninist conclusions are inapplicable to present-day realities and shows that the role of the working class as reformer of social relations has not only diminished but been steadily maturing.

G. Sogomorian in the article "New Crusade against Communism: Ideology and Practice" reveals that the new anti-Communist "crusade" declared by Washington is in essence nothing but imperialist reaction to the changes in the world which are characterized by the strengthening of the position of real socialism and national liberation movement on the one hand and the narrowing of the sphere of imperialist domination on the other. The article considers in this connection such issues as the lessons of history and the two approaches to the correlation of between ideology and foreign-policy practice; apart from that the article exposes the "psychological war" as a tool of reaction and aggressive forces as an attempt to take revenge in relation to the growing peace-loving forces, democracy and social progress. The article comes to a conclusion that the new "crusade" against communism contradicts present-day world realities, the objective march of history and hence is doomed to failure as all previous ones were.

The USSR in a clear, sharp and concrete form poses the question of the need to avert a nuclear war, to eliminate it from the life of society says V. Petrovskiy in the article "Key Problem of International Policy" (Not to be the first to use the atomic weapon). Referring to the historical aspect of the problem under consideration the author speaks of the peaceful initiatives of the Soviet Union which have played and still are playing a positive role in the solution of this topical problem. The article notes the foreign-policy activities of the Soviet Union, the only state in the world which has correctly committed itself not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. Seeking to rally the peace-loving states and the public in solving this task the USSR submitted to the UN General Assembly a document entitled: "Prevention of Nuclear Catastrophe: Declaration of the General Assembly." The Declaration says that states and statesmen first resorting to nuclear arms should be declared guilty of committing a grave crime against the world community. The form in which the USSR poses the problem of averting a nuclear war made it the pivotal problem of international dialogue, serving at the same time as a grave warning to the advocates of the course of stepping up nuclear weapons production and realization of broad strategic rearmament programs. The article highlights some new Soviet initiatives voiced in 1983, one of which is the proposal for the conclusion of a treaty on the mutual renunciation of the use of armed force and the maintenance of relations of peace between members of the Warsaw Treaty Organization and NATO, an agreement ruling out the possibility of anyone being the first to use not only nuclear but also conventional weapons.

The article "Capitalist Gold Market: Trends of Development" by A. Khandruev is dedicated to the examination of the specific market where gold appears not as a measure of value but a commodity, though a particular one. The emergence of this specific market was followed by the growing dependence of the price of gold on the economic conditions. In other words the price of gold is under heavy pressure of the economic factors. The evidence relating to the 1970's proves this conclusion by sharp fluctuations of the price of gold stemming from the changing economic environment.

The author traces the main factors determining the structure and dynamism of supply on the gold market, including the analysis of the appropriate natural

resources and also the investigation of the central banks gold manipulations undertaken to meet the mounting monetary discrepancies. The statistical data and empirical evidence prove the fact that the function of supply would probably take the parabolic form.

Demand on the gold market is essentially dependent on the scales of the intermediary and final consumption. Demonetization of gold brought about the intensive gold expectations among various factors influencing the demand. The decline of credit to the national currencies led to the run away into material values, gold in particular.

After 1968, when the price of gold began to liberate from the noneconomic restriction, high, though unstable demand along with low supply involved its upsurge. The gap between supply and demand brings about the factors that offset even relative stabilization of the sales/purchases conditions on the gold market. Thus recurrent attacks of the so-called "gold fever" become inevitable intensifying the instability of the capitalist monetary system.

I. Yegorov in the article "The Developing Countries Struggle for Economic Independence." (Results of a Decade) considers some internal and external aspects of the economic decolonization process in developing countries. The article describes how after substantial successes in strengthening their sovereignty over national resources. They considerably increased the rate of economic growth and begin a profound reconstruction of the existing national economic structure. Relying both upon the support of world socialism and its historical experience the developing states have in the past decade consolidated their positions in the world economy and brought to the attention of the world community the need to create a new international economic order. At the same time, the author notes, that every step of the developing countries along the road of strengthening national independence encounters the opposition of the imperialist states which at the end of the 1970's succeeded in delaying the progressive propositions of the New International Economic Order program. U.S. imperialism is taking particularly rigid stand on the New International Economic Order and is by all possible means seeking to stop the process of reconstruction of international economic relations. That is why the author concludes, the joint struggle of the socialist and developing countries against imperialism and neocolonialism today acquires particular importance in their efforts to make progress in reshaping the system of world economic relations.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1983.

CS0: 1812/198-E

ZAGLADIN LAUDS ENGELS' FRIENDSHIP, COLLABORATION WITH MARX

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 5,
May 83 pp 4-20

[Article by V. Zagladin: "Union of Titans"--passages between slantlines
published in boldface]

[Text] All progressive mankind marks this year, 1983, as the year of Karl Marx. This is done with good reason: because the trace which this truly great scholar and revolutionary has left in history is indelible.

No less justified is another fact, and that is that in all this year's publications devoted to Karl Marx, next to his name can be found that of Friedrich Engels. It is impossible to separate the one from the other because Marxism is a result of the creative work and the heroic feat of thought and action of these titans of the social and national liberation of the individual and mankind.

Finally, it is also quite natural that next to the names of K. Marx and F. Engels another name is usually mentioned, that of Vladimir Lenin. What K. Marx and F. Engels have accomplished is inseparable from the creative contribution which Vladimir Ilyich Lenin has made to the development of revolutionary science and revolutionary action. Yu.V. Andropov writes: "In our time Marxism is simply not possible without and outside Leninism."*

To study comprehensively the thought and action of Marx together with the thought and action of Engels and Lenin is not only a task for historians. Such a study forms a necessary and indispensable part of contemporary revolutionary practice and is one of the decisive prerequisites for the further social transformation of the life of human society.

I

As Marx often said, mankind sets itself only those tasks which it is capable of solving. This principle fully refers to Marxism itself, which emerged as

* "Kommunist" No 3, 1983, p 11.

a doctrine not before historical developments had provided the necessary prerequisites for it and generated a social need for the emergence of such a genuinely scientific theory of the revolutionary transformation of the world.

Let us recall that the first few decades of the 19th century during which Marxism was born and when it was transformed from the initial, far from finished conclusions into a harmonious theory, that these decades marked in many respects a turning point. This was a period when mankind was faced with a whole number of new and previously unknown questions. This was a period which generated the dire need to discover and find the answers to these questions.

Indeed, in the first decades of the 19th century a significant qualitatively change had been achieved in the development of production forces and in the major European countries there was a transition to mass machine and industrial production. The development of the natural sciences and their progress--beyond compare with that of the past--placed in the hands of mankind not only new instruments of recognizing the surrounding nature but also the means of utilizing ever more effectively the forces of nature for its benefit. All this was also closely connected with profound social changes. Capitalist relations were firmly established in most European countries. Capitalism was also taking root in North America.

By this time certain classes had already formed in the bourgeois society: in particular the process of the formation and development of the working class.

The Chartist movement in England and the uprisings of textile workers in Lyons (France) and Silesia (Germany) in the forties and fifties the 19th century became the first conscious moves of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, moves already undertaken from the proletariat's own class positions.

A new stage of social development was beginning, a stage which corresponded to a basically new task, that of overcoming not only capitalism as such but also the domination of private ownership as a whole and liquidating any rule based on the exploitation and oppression of one individual by another.

The social sciences of that period developed no less rapidly than the natural sciences. Very significant results were achieved in the sphere of philosophy, political economy and history.

However, the progress of social sciences had not yet reached a level at which they could not only explain that which had taken place in the past or that which is taking place at present but also point out the paths of further social development.

Admittedly, numerous socialist and even communist theories did come into being. Their authors appealed for a basic transformation of social relations. That these theories emerged was undoubtedly a reflection of pressing historical necessity. However, they lacked a sufficiently profound scientific basis and did not utilize to the full extent that which science had already achieved by this time. What is most important, all these theories were not connected with real life and the real struggle of those new social forces which were

generated by the domination of capital. Above all they were not connected with the social activity and the struggle of the proletariat.

Many people were aware of the limited, incomplete and immature nature of the highest achievements of pre-Marxist social thought, but this awareness did not lead to practical results. It was time for a genuinely scientific theory of social development to appear, a theory which could in reality become an instrument for the revolutionary transformation of the world. The minds of geniuses were required for this theory to come into existence. People were needed who were capable of delving into the deep meaning of events, creating a reliable method of seeing the world and its transformation, elaborating a truly scientific world outlook, comprehending the historic role of the proletariat as the main force of the communist transformation of the world and beginning to practically merge the theory of social development with the revolutionary movement of the workers class.

These historic tasks were accomplished by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels.

II

A genius is always a mystery. Nevertheless, the arrival of a genius is always predictable V.I. Lenin wrote: "...In the course of their struggle great revolutions always bring up great people and develop talents which have previously seemed impossible."*

The era in which the workers' movement arose and when the socialist, proletarian stage of the evolutionary process began, could not but bring forth historic leaders in keeping with this stage's greatness, scope and tasks. Such leaders did emerge. To a certain extent it was a law-governed phenomenon that it was precisely Marx who became a figure personifying scientific thought and revolutionary practice connected with mankind's transition from capitalism to socialism.

A lot has been written about Marx. The range of literature devoted to him continues to expand. It expands rapidly and irrepressibly. Nevertheless, we are still lacking a general work which--dealing with the subject on a highly scientific level, a level adequate to that of Marx's own works--would sum up all the sociohistorical and personal-psychological features which made Marx what he is and which created and forged this great and truly unique historic personality.

The demand for a work (or works) of this type is, of course, very great because it is not only the essence of the theory created by Marx together with Engels but also everything which concerns him as a human being that is subjected by the opponents of Marxism to monstrous distortions.

This is a characteristic and very revealing detail. This year, which is the year of Marx, not only the "respectable" scientific bourgeois literature

* V.I. Lenin, "Complete Works", vol 38, p 78.

but also the Western information media are devoting great attention to Marx.

This seems strange: How is this possible and how has it happened? In reality there is nothing to be surprised about. As the declaration of the Presidium of the Executive of the German Communist Party quite correctly notes, "even the powers to be in the Federal Republic cannot completely ignore the moral obligation to appraise at his true worth the man whose work belongs to the great cultural achievements of mankind."*

Of course, the bourgeois press, radio and television are "paying their due" to Marx in a very peculiar way which also includes blatant falsifications and distortions of his image. They would like to paint Marx in a way which would repel our contemporaries both away from Marx himself and from his teaching.

Their aim is clear: to disparage in this or that way the immortal image of the great scholar and revolutionary whose theory and cause have won unprecedented fame and popularity in the world, incomparable to those of anybody else. Therefore, everybody who is sincerely faithful to the great teaching and cause initiated by the founder of scientific communism is faced again and again, and in its totality, with the honorable task of demonstrating again and again to the entire world and first and foremost to working mankind the true image of Marx, the image which can even today set an example not only of a great scholar and outstanding revolutionary but also of a Man with a capital "M".

The real Marx was exceptionally honest, humanely noble, devoted in friendship and faithful in love. The genuine image of the "Moor" was characterized by very profound principle-mindedness, truly selfless devotion to his revolutionary duty and to the ideas of socially transforming the world.

As one of his friends wrote, Marx made the impression of a "person built of energy, willpower and indestructible conviction."** This was really true. No intrigues of his enemies, no persecutions, no hardships encountered in life could defeat him.

There were cases when in order to meet the most urgent expenses the Marx's had to pawn everything, including their clothes. Marx once wrote with bitter humor to Adolf Kluss together with the manuscript of the "Revelations about the Cologne Trial of Communists": "...Due to the lack of trousers and shoes, the author is under a kind of house arrest..."***

However, even under these conditions Marx never even for a minute discontinued his creative studies which were so important for the cause of the workers class.

* "Unsere Zeit", 12 Jan 1983.

** "Recollections about Marx and Engels," Moscow, 1956, p 280.

*** K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works", vol 28, p 470.

F. Engels wrote: "The Moor could fly into a rage but he never lost heart."*

Yes, he had an extraordinarily strong personality but at the same time he was human and nothing human was alien to him. He was a powerful man who loved life in all its manifestations and strove to make it better, more beautiful and kind not only for himself but also for others, for all the working people and all mankind.

However, it was not the highest human qualities alone which made Marx what he was.

Karl Marx has forever gone down in history as a great scholar and outstanding practicing revolutionary. His genius mind and his iron will allowed him to delve into the deepest treasures of contemporary science.

Wilhelm Liebknecht once recalled the energy with which Marx insisted that his friends and confederates study: "study! Study! This was his categorical demand which he often instilled in us but which was already contained in his personal example and even simply in watching this constant and powerful work of a great mind."** Resolutely protesting against the neglect of theory manifested by some participants in the contemporary workers movement, Marx insisted: "Ignorance has never helped anyone!"*** Friedrich Engels called his friend "a genius fully armed with knowledge."**** On another occasion he maintained: "However, this was far from the main thing about him. Science was for Marx a historical revolutionary force... Because Marx was first and foremost a revolutionary. To participate in one way or another in overthrowing the capitalist society and the state institutions which it had created, to participate in liberating the contemporary proletariat whom /he/ was the first to arm with the awareness of its own situation and requirements and the awareness of the conditions of its liberation--this was in reality the vocation of his life. Struggle was his medium."*****

Marx was always aware of the most recent events on the fronts of class battles and the struggle for the national freedom of the peoples. He strove to respond to them immediately with practical actions. Seeing and delving into their essence with the help of a scientific method he extended and perfected this method on the basis of his investigations while at the same time developing his skill as a scholar and his experience as a revolutionary.

As a founder of the "League of Communists" and the First International and organizer of the workers' solidarity campaign with the Paris Commune, Marx, according to Yu.V. Andropov, "thus became the first communist in the most contemporary meaning of the word and the instigator of our movement which at

* K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works", vol 36, p 31.

** "Recollections about Marx and Engels," p 95.

*** Ibid., p 282.

**** See K. Marx and F Engels, "Works," vol 35, p 386.

***** Ibid., vol 19, p 351.

present embraces all the world."*

He was a titan but a titan who did not tower over mankind as something unattainable but raised mankind to the level of his genius. At the same time he was amazingly modest. Friedrich Lessner, who often met with Marx, recalled that Marx was absolutely free of conceit.** He valued every honest aspiration and every opinion based on independent thinking.

III

Undoubtedly Marx's personal qualities played a great role in shaping him as a founder of scientific socialism. Nevertheless, taken in themselves these qualities alone far from reveal all the aspects of this process.

It can be said without any doubt that the personal qualities of Marx would not have been able to develop fully if he had not had Friedrich Engels at his side. As a revolutionary doctrine, Marxism is not only the result of the mind of a genius, or to be more precise two minds of genius, but it was also generated by their extraordinary friendship, unprecedented creative interaction and mutual loyalty, qualities the like of which have never been known in the history of science or in the history of revolutionary struggle.

The collaboration of Marx and Engels is a truly amazing phenomenon. Indeed, in many aspects they were dissimilar people. They belonged to different strata of society, strata which were, if anything, antagonistically opposed to each other.

Karl Marx was the son of a lawyer who had "made it," having overcome poverty. He was the son of a well-educated man who knew and valued classical philosophy and literature. From his early years Karl Marx grew up in an atmosphere of mutual respect and kindness, enlightenment and humanitarianism. He received a fundamental classical education, first in a high school then at the universities of Bonn and Berlin.

Friedrich Engels was born and brought up in the "thoroughly Christian Prussian" family of a well-to-do factory owner where a strict patriarchal spirit reigned supreme, which was precisely the opposite of the atmosphere which existed in the Marx house. Engels' father, who wanted to make his son a businessman at any cost, did not even allow him to finish high school. Friedrich Engels spent little time attending the University of Berlin which he did as an external student during his military service. All his knowledge and experience are entirely his own achievement and the result of his talent and industriousness. How often he had to act against the tastes and desires of his family and his surroundings!

* "Kommunist" No 3, 1983, p 10.

** "Recollection about Marx and Engels," p 163.

What then about the genius of Marx and the genius of Engels? Were they not similar to each other?

Marx was an exceptionally thorough person, exacting in every detail to the point of being captious, perfecting every phrase and striving to combine the immaculate strictness of meaning and elegance with the fine logical structure of each sentence. It was typical of him to attempt to assimilate a "Mont Blanc" of facts on literally every question, to acquaint himself with all the existing ideas and concepts on the given problem and to consider every question in all its connections and consequences.

Engels was amazingly quick of thought and to a great extent was a person of first impressions who passionately burned and immediately generated new ideas. He reacted instantly to every new phenomenon and avidly absorbed everything that he had seen or heard. Marx wrote to Engels: "The ability to work fast, which is characteristic of your nature, always spontaneously manifests itself again and again."*

Such qualities could lead anybody else to become superficial, not seeing below the surface, but not Engels, who at the same time was characterized by his profound approach, by the thoroughness of a scientist as well as by his phenomenal breadth of vision and high sense of responsibility.

It is difficult to refrain from quoting here the contemporary descriptions of the appearances of Marx and Engels, two portraits which cannot fail to impress by their contrast.

This is, for example, how Paul Lafargue described the appearance of Karl Marx: "...He was a strongly built man, taller than average with broad shoulders, well-developed chest and proportionately built... If he had played a lot of sports when he was young he would have become very strong. The only physical exercise which he did regularly was walking..."**

This portrait is supplemented by the words of Friedrich Lessner: "He was of average height with broad shoulders, well-built, energetic with a high noble forehead, thick raven-black hair and a penetrating look. His mouth even then had this sarcastic expression which was so much feared by his opponents."***

And here is the description of Engels' appearance made by the Cologne police which persecuted this outstanding revolutionary: "...Height--five feet eight inches; hair and eyebrows--dark brown; forehead--average; eyes--grey; nose and mouth--regular, teeth--good; beard--chestnut-colored; chin and face--oval; complexion--healthy; build--good."****

Let us again supplement this truly police-like characterization with the words of the observant Lessner: "Engels was tall and well-built, his movements were

* K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works", vol 31, p 60.

** "Recollections about Marx and Engels," p 67.

*** Ibid., p 151.

**** K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works", vol 5, p 547.

quick and assured, his speech--laconic and resolute; he held himself very straight which made him look like a military man. He had a very buoyant personality. All his jokes were to the point. Everyone who met him immediately got the impression that he was dealing with an extraordinarily talented person."*

Thus, we have two different personalities. The opponents of Marxism are doing their best to try and find some basic differences in their approach to this or that problem. Just as they are striving to oppose the young Marx to the mature Marx, they are pitting Marx against Engels as such and particularly to the latter-day Engels. They are striving to represent the latter almost as a founder of revisionism and a man who allegedly was prepared to reject (if he had not already done so) the revolutionary essence of Marxist teaching and agree with the theory of class cooperation and with the idea and practice of reconciling antagonistic class interests.

However, all this is pure falsification from start to finish.

Of course, the creative activity of Marx, just like the creative activity of Engels, developed and underwent an evolution in the course of time. But this evolution did not lead to their abandoning the basic principles of Marxism and its revolutionary essence. This evolution cannot be regarded anything other than creatively developing the ideas which transform social life in a revolutionary fashion.

Marx never until his very death rejected any of his basic ideas formulated in his youth. However, he did, of course, develop these ideas, fill them with a new and more profound content and enrich them on the basis of assimilating the recent achievements of science and revolutionary practice.

The same can be said of the development of Engels' creative activity. Working at first with Marx and parallel to him he developed their common ideas, constantly enriching them with his own observations and conclusions. After Marx's death Engels bore on his shoulders the work of completing that which Marx had not had time to finish while continuing his own work as a very great leader of the revolutionary Social Democrats of the late 19th century.

The differences in the creative activity of Marx and Engels and the different emphases and turns of thought which appeared at certain stages in their inspired work actually constitute that which made Marxism a living, developing and profoundly creative teaching. The difference in the talents, inclinations, and the quality of characters of the two great friends resulted in a striking unity, an organic fusion of wisdom, perspicacity, theoretical depth, and revolutionary boldness.

IV

We have already said that every genius is a mystery. Even more mysterious and thrilling is the union of these two geniuses and titans.

* "Recollections about Marx and Engels," p 172.

At present it is a widespread conviction that scientific-theoretical work presupposes broad collectivism, collegiality and interaction not only between groups of scientists from the same sphere but also between specialists from different branches of knowledge. This is indeed so.

Working together and practically without assistants, K. Marx and F. Engels probably represented the most perfect known collective of scientists, revolutionaries and practical workers.

The efficiency of this collective and its creative output are truly unprecedented. They made very great discoveries in the different spheres of knowledge and applied them in practice, which marked the initial transformation of the social aspect of mankind and contributed to changing the picture of the whole world. History had not known and does not yet know anything similar.

Much has already been said about the collaboration of K. Marx and F. Engels, primarily in various biographical works about both of them and in studies devoted to certain concrete questions and aspects of Marxism. However, it must be acknowledged that there are as yet no papers exhaustively revealing the laboratory of Marx's and Engels' joint creative activity and the mechanism of their cooperation.

Meanwhile, to study this laboratory and recognize this mechanism would certainly contribute a great deal to uncovering the laws of scientific creation as such and the psychology of collectively developing sciences and revolutionary practice.

Without going into detail let us point out just a few aspects of the interreaction between Marx and Engels which are significant both for historians and for practical revolutionary workers.

First of all, the following question cannot fail to excite interest, that is, how it came about that two different people arrived at the same time and in fact following parallel routes to the same conclusion: that it is necessary to liquidate the capitalist system with its characteristic exploitation; that the old system must be exchanged for a new--socialist and communist--system which embodies a truly humanitarian society and that the motive force and active agent of this greatest social transformation in history must be the proletariat.

Marx started by analyzing the logic of the ideas and criticizing the philosophy of contemporary bourgeois society. His very great philosophical erudition developed in him an enormous analytical intellectual power and a capability (and striving) to search deeply, to penetrate the essence of things and go right down to the bottom of them. In every new formulation of a question Marx saw not the end but rather the beginning of an intellectual analytical process.

It was precisely this approach of his as well as his critical analysis of classical German philosophy and the achievements of French historical science which led Marx to his above-mentioned conclusions.

In the early 40's Marx, who was still very young at the time, arrived at the conclusion that "...The class which at present possesses nothing /demands/ its share of the wealth of the middle classes." This is a fact that "strikes everybody on the streets of Manchester, Paris and Lyons."* The young philosopher concluded that it is necessary not just to come out in favor of freedom as such or democracy, or justice as such, but that it is necessary to struggle absolutely concretely "in the interests of the poor and politically and socially deprived masses."** Consequently, the criticism of the existing order of things and policy must also be connected "with a certain party-minded position in politics and therefore our criticism must be connected with and equated to the /real/ struggle."*** "Just as philosophy finds its /material/ weapon in the proletariat, so the proletariat finds its /intellectual/ weapon in philosophy..."****

These words were written in 1844. They demonstrate that by this moment the choice had already been made. It was still theoretical but already at that time, in 1844 theory begins to join practice.

In Paris Marx comes into contact with representatives of workers organizations, both French and foreign--German--ones. Direct contact with them leaves an indelible impression on him. In August 1844 he writes to Ludwig Feuerbach: "You should have been present at one of the meetings of French workers to convince yourself of the virginal freshness and nobility of these people worn out by labor... History is preparing a practical element for emancipating the individual from these 'barbarians' of our civilized society"*****

Friedrich Engels also devoted substantial interest to philosophy. However, it was not the world of ideas which provided him with the material to draw conclusion about the prospects of the society's development and the role played by the proletariat in determining it. His observations of life and his experience as a businessman provided him with this material. Engels could see with his own eyes all the stages of shaping the worker, both as the main production force of society and as the subject of class struggle. He avidly imbibed all that he saw and heard. As a highly emotional person who was nevertheless blessed with the capacity for critical and rational thought he could not fail to react to what he saw, heard and felt.

In March-April 1839 a Hamburg magazine TELEGRAPH FÜR DEUTSCHLAND published an article "Letters from Wuppertal" which was the first publicistic attempt of the 18-year old Engels. Passionate and denouncingly sarcastic in places it was in fact an accusation. Of course the young author was yet far from understanding the real causes of capitalist exploitation but he had grasped its essence very profoundly.

His stay in England--this Mecca of contemporary capitalism--enriched Engels'

* K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works", vol 1, p 115.

** Ibid., p 125.

*** Ibid., p 381.

**** Ibid., p 428

***** Ibid., vol 27, p 381.

impressions and allowed him to substantially extend and expand the limits of his analysis. The fact that the new employee of the firm "(Ermen) and Engels" not only mastered to perfection the so-called "secrets of the trade" and grasped the mechanism of exploitation but he also became quite well-acquainted with the life of the English workers--this fact also contributed to broadening his analysis. He wrote about this period of his life: "I left the society and dinner parties, the port and champagne of the bourgeoisie and devoted my leisure hours almost exclusively to associating with real workers..."*

At the end of 1842 F. Engels formulated the conclusions from his studies and observations in an article for the "Rheinische Zeitung:" "...Only by violently overthrowing the existing unnatural relations and radically bringing down the nobility and industrial aristocracy can the material situation of the proletarians be improved."** Engels considered the forming of the proletariat "a very important result" of historical development.

At the end of February 1844 the first issue of the "German-French Yearbook" edited by Marx was published in Paris, carrying an article by Engels: "Sketches for a Critique of Political Economy." At the end of the following year, 1845, a book by Engels entitled "The Conditions of the Working Class in England" was published. Later Vladimir Ilyich Lenin was to write: "Engels was /the first/ to say that the proletariat is /not only/ a suffering class and that it is precisely the shameful economic situation of the proletariat which irrepressibly pushes it forward and forces it to struggle for its final liberation. The fighting proletariat /will come to its own aid/."***

V

Marx and Engels took different roads to arrive at one and the same correct conclusion. Their first meeting took place in November 1842 (let us recall that Marx at that time was 24, whereas Engels was 22). Engels who by this time had several times contributed to the "Rheinische Zeitung" edited by Marx (he often published his articles under a penname and it is still not known whether the editor of the paper knew who it stood for) decided that he must meet the editor of the publication personally.

Two years later in early 1844 when Engels sent his first articles (including "The Drafts for Critique of Political Economy") to Paris for the "German-French Yearbook" prepared by Marx, the latter realized that he was dealing with a truly likeminded person. The articles were published. A lively correspondence sprang up between London and Paris. Then somewhat later Karl and Friedrich met never to part again throughout all their lives.

Let us note that in spite of all the difference of their personalities, characters and lives Marx and Engels found a very solid and reliable foundation for their friendship and cooperation which was the unity of their views, social aims and aspirations. In 1819 in his essay "Hired Labor and

* K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works", vol 2, p 235.

** Ibid., vol 1, p 503.

*** V.I. Lenin, "Complete Works," vol 2, p 9.

Capital" Marx wrote: "We want the workers to understand us."* Later, at the end of the sixties he noted with great satisfaction: "The understanding with which "Das Kapital" was met by the broad circles of the German workers class is the best reward for my work."** And what about Engels? Here is what he said already in the evening of his life with all wisdom and resolve: "...as long as I have strength I will staunchly fight for the liberation of the working class."*** The unity of their ideological, creative and revolutionary aspirations firmly knitted together these two great theoreticians and practical workers. Let us repeat once again, that much has been written about their friendship. However, probably no one describes them better than Lenin who wrote: "Old tales tell us of various touching examples of friendship. The European proletariat can say that its science has been created by two scholars and fighters whose mutual relations surpass even the most touching ancient tales of human friendship."****

Indeed Marx and Engels were for each other a source of constant creative inspiration and fortitude. Both in happiness and in troubles, during the days of revolutions and under the conditions when reaction triumphed they stood side by side in spirit, even when they were physically separated.

Such days were many. Karl and Friedrich were forced to live apart for about 20 years. However, their relations not only did not become weaker because of this but, on the contrary, their separation accompanied by their extremely intensive exchange of letters contributed to strengthening the friendly ties between them. The correspondence between Marx and Engels at the time is a truly unique monument of epistolary art. Their messages to each other are anxious and emotional documents which at the same time attest to extraordinary depth and clarity of human thought. They are examples of pointed and vivid publicism and at the same time an unsurpassed chronicle of contemporary history. They are the summit of theory and pearls of practical advice and considerations.

How much happiness was granted them on the occasions when they were together! From the recollections of their contemporaries we know quite a lot about these rare but very happy moments. This is for example how Paul Lafargue described them: "When Engels announced his arrival there was a celebration in the Marx family. During the time of expectation he was constantly talked about and on the very day of his arrival Marx could not work for impatience. Supporting their strength with the help of tobacco the friends stayed up through the night so they could talk to their hearts' content about all that had taken place since their last meeting."*****

Constant concern for each other was the rule of life for these great friends. During the period of the forced emigration of his closest comrade to Switzerland, after the revolution of 1848-1849 had been suppressed Marx wrote:

* K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works", vol 6, p 429.

** Ibid., vol 23, p 13.

*** Ibid., vol 37, p 449.

**** V.I. Lenin, "Complete Works", vol 2, p 12.

***** "Recollections about Marx and Engels," p 75.

"Dear Engels! I was very much worried about you...."* This concern was far from being expressed only in the letters, it was also expressed in mobilizing all his friends to save Engels from persecution and danger.

Engels responded with no less touching and loyal support. It is known that the life of Marx's family was completely taken up by Karl's creative work and was often very hard. On all occasions Friedrich always rushed to their aid displaying the greatest possible selflessness. Thus, starting 1850 for many years he once again earned his living as a shop assistant. Why? According to him the "dog's commerce"** was the only way for him to help Marx by giving his friend the possibility to concentrate on the most important thing, his work on "Das Kapital." Marx wrote to Engels: "Through all the terrible torments suffered during these days I have always been sustained by the thought about you and your friendship and by the hope that the two of us have as yet something reasonable to accomplish on earth."*** It also happened sometimes that so-called well-wishers tried to spoil relations between Marx and Engels not stopping at most malicious calumny and provocations. However, the friends immediately recognized these intrigues and resolutely swept them aside. During one of such moments Marx wrote to Engels: "How could you have thought that I would desert you even for one minute. You are invariably my closest friend as I hope I am yours."**** This was written in the early years of their friendship. Here are some lines from their letters dating back to a much later period. Answering one of his correspondents who had tried to offer himself as "mediator" between the friends in their financial affairs Marx declared: "...You have an absolutely wrong idea about my relations with /Engels/. He is my closest friend. I have no /secrets/ from him." "Without him I would have been forced long ago to go into some 'profitable business'. That is why I don't want /by any means/ some third party to intercede for me."*****

VI

The main aspect of the friendship between Marx and Engels was their /working interaction and creative union/. Ascribing great value to each other's views and opinions they drew powerful stimuli from their association to continuously develop their creative thought. Their correspondence is particularly characteristic in this respect because here the process of elaborating common views and jointly making their positions more profound is clearly to be seen.

Their ability and desire to exchange views and thoughts and to transmit to each other their impressions of what they had seen, heard and grasped is also clearly to be traced in their letters. Constantly enriching each other Marx and Engels did not just double but quadrupled the abilities of each other. Yet there was no selfishness or secretiveness. Each regarded the other as

* K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works", vol 27, p 131.

** Ibid., vol 31, p 248.

*** Ibid., vol 28, p 371.

**** Ibid., vol 27, p 123.

***** Ibid., vol 31, p 449.

"his alter ego."

The works by Marx and Engels, starting with their articles which were simultaneously published in 1844 in the "German-French Yearbook," confront the researchers of their creative activity with another exciting task, namely of grasping more deeply their mutual influence and of penetrating, as it were, the secret of how the one stimulated the creative activity of the other.

In this connection it must be taken into account that their store of knowledge was far from identical. Marx was an outstanding expert in philosophy and history and a very profound specialist in the sphere of political economy. Engels had perfect knowledge of the practical economy of contemporary capitalism. He had studied in great detail military science, philosophy and the geography and history of many peoples. At the same time of course he also possessed an enormous and ever increasing store of knowledge in the sphere of philosophy and political economy.

In the fifties and sixties the friends came to the conclusion that it was necessary to delve deeply into the sphere of natural science, which became particularly important in light of the disputes about world outlook which were becoming frequent in the workers movement. It was in this sphere of natural science, which became particularly important in light of the disputes about world outlook which were becoming frequent in the workers movement. It was in this sphere as well that both their cooperation and the differences in the tastes and inclinations of both thinkers manifested themselves. As their correspondence shows, Marx took up predominantly mathematics and geology, whereas Engels concentrated his attention on physics, chemistry, biology and anthropology.

On the whole Marx and Engels complemented each other perfectly. There is no single work of any significance by either of them which had not been previously discussed (personally or through correspondence) with the other. It often happened that one provided the other with the necessary background information, factual data or theoretical considerations. Naturally this enriched them both and made their creative activity extraordinarily profound and multifaceted.

Both friends reacted particularly sensitively to everything that was new, to every fresh thought. Their ability to "run across"--constantly and at the same time--as yet unexplored questions in virtually every subject which they turned to is truly amazing.

Both were also characterized by their ability to listen to others and learn from them even if the people in question were their enemies.

Neither Marx nor Engels by any means equated their critical attitude to certain views with out-of-hand denial or unconditional rejection of those ideas with which they were confronted. To take all the best, most valuable and interesting; to uncover contradictions of thought; even to utilize, at worst, false and hostile ideas to deepen and develop revolutionary thought--this was the method of work adopted by the two friends. In other words

both of them were characterized by their extraordinary ability to link polemicizing with explaining their own point of view, to link throwing light upon the topical problems of class struggle with discussing the main principles of scientific communism.

All of this taken together provides us with the key to uncover the secret of the joint creative activity of Marx and Engels. This secret was hidden in their reciprocity, intertwining and mutual initiative. At times Marx's idea was the flint while that of Engels was the steel (ognivo), at times it was the other way around.

It sometimes happened that Engels was the first to come up with an idea which Marx then adopted and elaborated profoundly and in great detail. In fact it was precisely Engels who gave Marx a push to delve deeply into the political economy of capitalism, the area in which the works of Marx caused a complete transformation. To a certain extent it was due to Engels that "Das Kapital" was based on a theory which regards the development of a socioeconomic formation as a natural historical process.* The article by Engels "Sketches for A Critique of Political Economy" in fact gave Marx the first impulse to write "Das Kapital". Marx considered this article to be a "brilliant sketch."** He made notes from it and often referred to it in his works.

As far as the book by Engels "The Conditions of the Working Class in England" is concerned, Marx admired in what "fresh and passionate way, with what bold foresight and totally without any scholarly or scientific doubts this work was written!"***

On the other hand many examples can be cited of how Marx instigated and directed Engels' thinking and stimulated his creative search!

The joint creative activity of Marx and Engels, starting with the "Holy Family", "German Ideology" and of course the "Communist Manifesto," is quite a remarkable phenomenon. All these and other joint works by Marx and Engels are as if written in the same spirit and by the same hand. The unity of their views, approaches and style and by the same hand. The unity of their views, approaches and style resulting from the common ideological platform are here revealed in their highest form.

The two friends often wrote for each other and made considerable insertions in each other's works. Who was the author of this or that fragment was usually established much later and as a rule this happened by chance. The latest example of this kind is "Anti-Durhing". Talking of the history of this work Engels wrote: "I would like to mention in passing that since the world outlook presented in this book has in its most important part been elaborated and developed by Marx and only in its most negligible part by myself, it goes without saying that this paper of mine cannot be published without his knowledge. I read the entire manuscript to him before giving it to the

* Friedrich Engels, "Biography", Moscow, 1972, p 269.

** See K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works", vol 13, p 8.

*** Ibid., vol 30, p 280.

publishers. The 10th chapter of the section on political economy ('From "Critical History"') was written by Marx and it was only due to external considerations that "I had unfortunately somewhat to shorten it. This has for a long time been our tradition: to help each other in specialized spheres of knowledge."*

They also wrote in each other's names. It is well-known that for a number of years Engels wrote articles for the NEW YORK TRIBUNE in the name of Marx. Of course the ideas presented in them were their common ideas. They resulted from joint studies and discussions. However, it was Engels who wrote the articles and it was in the name of Marx that they were sent off. This was a manifestation of the profound trust placed by Marx in his friend and on the other hand it displayed the great nobility on the part of Engels who did not spare anything to make it possible for Marx to continue working on "Das Kapital."

And of course here we arrive at this completely amazing phenomenon in the history of science--"Das Kapital." As has already been pointed out the first impulse to write it was given to Marx by Engels, whereas the truly titantic work of creating it was contributed by Marx himself.

In the course of his work Marx constantly consulted Engels, both personally and through correspondence. The opinion of his friend was the most valuable and important one for him. Marx did not try to conceal this. Thus, once while mailing the proof-sheets of "Das Kapital" to Engels, Karl wrote that Friedrich's opinion is "more important" to him "than anything that the world might say in this regard,"** Is it then surprising that the publication of the first volume of "Das Kapital" was a triumph and a great day for both friends?

...Having finished on 16 August 1867 proofreading the last page of the first volume of "Das Kapital" Marx could not refrain from immediately writing to Engels: "So, /this volume is ready/. That it became possible is entirely /your/ achievement. Without your self-sacrifice for my sake I would never have been able to complete all the enormous work on these three volumes. I embrace you full of gratitude!"*** However, Marx only had time to complete the first volume of his brilliant work himself. As we know, all the rest was done by Engels.

Shortly before his death Marx told his daughter Eleonore that Engels could "make something" out of his unfinished manuscripts. However, even without this request Engels naturally considered the completion of Marx's work one of the most important goals of his life. Embarking on the second volume of "Das Kapital" he wrote: "A lot of work will be required because for a man like Marx every word is worth its weight in gold. But this work is a pleasure for me because I am again with my old friend."**** Engels not only brought

* K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works", vol 2, p 9.

** Ibid., vol 31, p 259.

*** Ibid., p 275.

**** Ibid., vol 36, p 24.

order to Marx's manuscripts but also edited them. Where it was necessary he supplemented Marx's work and wrote individual fragments, striving to make the creation of his great older comrade as full, complete and profound as possible.

V.I. Lenin evaluated very highly the work accomplished by Engels. He particularly emphasized how "attentatively and thoughtfully Engels "followed... precisely the changes in modern capitalism and how he therefore succeeded in foreseeing to a certain extent the tasks of our era, the imperialist era."* Lenin regarded the second and third volumes of "Das Kapital" a joint work by Marx and Engels. However, Engels himself, who was amazingly modest, free from every desire for self-promotion and who loathed all kinds of manifestations of worship, never tired of repeating: "And, ultimately, I am mainly just reaping the glory of Marx's work!"**

Here we have mainly been talking about the joint work of Marx and Engels in the theoretical sphere. Much could also be said about their joint practical activity (although it covers only individual periods of their life and activity as they were destined, as they say, to live apart). This practical activity can be defined in a short and laconic way--it was engaging in class struggle, preparing the proletariat for the battles to come and constantly fighting against the numerous enemies. F. Engels marvelously described the principles of their joint struggle: it is necessary "not to wriggle and dodge under the blows dealt by the opponent as many are still doing, not to howl and whimper and not to babble excuses... It is necessary to exchange blow for blow and two or three blows for every one of the enemy's. Such have been our tactics for a long time and up to now we seem to have coped with all our opponents quite well."***

Each one had a role in this great alliance. It is quite obvious that in any case the creative activity of one is only part of their joint creative activity and the inseparability of Marx and Engels is not just a historical fact but a historic phenomenon of great importance. Wilhelm Liebknecht wrote: "...Marx and Engels represent a /united spirit/ which is indivisible... just as its creators were inseparable in all their thoughts and actions up to their very deaths and as they will continue to be for mankind in their creative works as long as there are people on earth."****

VII

The name of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, brilliant follower of Marx and Engels takes its lawful place next to theirs. The supporters of revolutionary Marxism-Leninism place them next to each other in order to emphasize the continuity and unity of their great teaching. As for the opponents, they do the same in order to try and prove that Marx, Engels and Lenin are "incompatible" and to demonstrate that their conclusions and ideals are almost conflicting. However, all these opponents so furiously denying the unity of Marxism and

* V.I. Lenin, "Complete Works," vol 33 p 67.

** K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works," vol 37, p 426.

*** Ibid., vol 35, pp 356-357.

**** W. Liebknecht, "Karl Marx, Biographical Study," Odessa, 1905, pp 21-22.

Leninism have one fault: they are completely at odds with reality--the real nature of Marxist doctrine and Leninist teaching and their real essence. Of course they are also at odds with the development of the living and genuine life as opposed to life invented by somebody.

Of course, it would be naive to maintain that there have never been and are no differences between the creative activity of K. Marx and that of V.I. Lenin. These differences are not contradictions, differences and not contrarieties.

K. Marx and V.I. Lenin acted in different historical times. It is quite understandable that the emphases in their creative activity are at times dissimilar. Thus, Marx for example, due to historical necessity devoted particular attention to uncovering and grasping the objective laws of the capitalist system of production and proving that its destruction is inevitable and that it was going to be exchanged for a higher communist social formation. On the other hand the activity of Lenin who continued solving this task under the conditions of imperialism, was to a great extent directed not only toward theoretically preparing but also practically carrying out the socialist revolution whose inevitability was first predicted by Marx.

The opponents of Marxism-Leninism often try to put forward the following "theory": Marx was allegedly in favor of the "quiet" development of events and pinned his main hopes on the spontaneous action of the objective laws of capitalist development. Lenin however "distorted" Marx and moved the center of gravity to the subjective factor and almost to the activity of "Conspirators" and to the role of the "active minority." Raising the question in this way opens the way to two lies at the same time. On the one hand, Marx who did in fact devote great attention to the impact of the objective laws of capitalism's development (indeed it was Marx who was the first person in history to uncover these laws) never let the subjective factor of history fall into oblivion. Suffice it to recall that it was no one else but Marx who saw in the proletariat armed with the philosophy of revolution the force which was called upon to liquidate capitalism and the domination of the relations of private ownership. On the other hand, Lenin who did indeed very thoroughly study the problems of the subjective factor in the revolution, namely the activity of the masses, the workers class and its party, never disengaged himself from objective circumstances. On the contrary, all his conclusions about the composition, nature and forms of activity of the subjective factor of history were always based on the very deep analysis of the objective course of the historical process.

We could of course continue to follow the operations performed by falsifiers who are trying to pit Marx and Engels against Lenin. There is however, no need to do so. The differences in the activity of Marx and Lenin are conditioned by the differences of times. In the words of Marx it was the stormy 19th century breathing and displaying all its living colors, the time when the workers class having emerged in the historical arena began to wage its battle against class opponents. The works of Lenin reflected the first decades of the great 20th century in all their multifaceted nature when the workers class embarked upon the practical implementation of its historic mission and having accomplished the October revolution began its revolutionary transformation of the world.

If Lenin did succeed in becoming the leader of the first victorious socialist revolution in the world and implementing that which Marx and Engels only dreamt

about, it was only because Lenin was infinitely devoted to the revolutionary doctrine of Marxism and considered it the cause of his life to implement it on the basis of developing it further and in accordance with the new era.

Lenin /knew/ Marx and Engels as no one else did. He knew them not as an uncritical dogmatist but as a genuine follower of Marxism true to its spirit and method. The works of Marx were Lenin's bible but not of the sort which gives all answers to all questions but that which provides a powerful working tool always ready for action and an instrument with whose help every job can be accomplished successfully.

As no one else Lenin /defended/ Marxism fiercely and passionately against those who vulgarized and distorted it. For him adhering to human and revolutionary duty and being true to the ideas of Marx were one and the same. In Marxism Lenin saw the source of constantly approaching truth.

Finally, as no one else Lenin was capable of /developing/ the theory of Marx, continuing his thoughts and applying his methods in analyzing the new social reality. Studying the works of Marx and Engels Lenin knew only part of them. Indeed an enormous number of works, not even second-rate, but first-rate as far as their importance is concerned, of the two great friends were only published after their death. Lenin did not know either the "German Ideology" or Marx's manuscripts of 1844 and 1855-1860. He did not know Engels's "Dialectics of Nature" or the greater part of the correspondence between Marx and Engels which was concealed from their followers by the rightist Social-Democrats.

Nevertheless, the ideas and principles formulated by Lenin organically expressed the essence contained in the above mentioned classic works of Marxism.

This is an amazing fact! Lenin wrote his paper "Materialism and Empirio-Criticism" without knowing most works and drafts by Marx and Engels on problems connected with natural science. However, the conclusions which he drew and which concern the very approach to scientific revolutions, to the properties of matter and its inexhaustibility and to the criteria of progress in natural science and its role in the history of society--these were on the whole the same conclusions as were made by Engels in his "Dialectics of Nature".

Nowadays studying Marxism-Leninism as a whole we naturally regard Lenin's ideas as having developed from the ideas of Marx and Engels. However, in a number of cases this was not just developing but making a very profound new discovery. And what is most important and striking is the fact that the discovery always fell within the main channel of Marx's thought and followed the main creative line of research undertaken by Marx and Engels.

By the way, many of the differences between the works of Marx and Engels on the one hand, and Lenin on the other which our ideological opponents are now trying to exploit are connected precisely with the fact that Lenin consistently extended Marx's ideas. It is precisely because he was a Marxist in the deepest sense that Lenin was capable of becoming a successor to the

work and activity of Marx and Engels and was capable of drawing new conclusions which have enriched our great revolutionary science.

/Marxism-Leninism as one whole is the highest synthesis of the thought of these three giants of revolutionary mankind./

K. Marx and F. Engels made two great discoveries which laid the foundation of Marxism as a science. The first one is their discovery of surplus value, which laid bare the secrets of the capitalist system and made it possible to explain the laws of the capitalist formation which condition the historical inevitability of its own destruction and the necessity that a new social system should win.

The second one is their discovery of the materialistic interpretation of history. In this case they were primarily talking of defining the social force which was to accomplish the liquidation of capitalism and secure the victory of socialism. In other words, they were talking of defining the universal-historical mission of the workers class.

Developing the teaching of Marx and Engels, V.I. Lenin uncovered the laws of revolutionary transition from capitalism to socialism at the new stage. He demonstrated that the victory of the revolution was possible in one individual country and elaborated and headed the practical assimilation of the realistic ways of the socialist transformation of the society. Thus, he pointed out the realistic way for the workers class to accomplish its mission. The activity of V.I. Lenin raised Marxism-Leninism to a new historical level. Whereas Marx and Engels transformed socialism from utopia into science, Lenin contributed in a decisive way to transforming it into victorious practice.

Many opponents of Marxist teaching relentlessly repeat that Marxism has become outdated. However, it was no one else than Lenin himself who while developing the ideas of Marx and Engels and creatively applying them to the conditions of a new historical era very convincingly proved that Marxism is a doctrine which is always alive and developing.

/The greatest achievement of Lenin is that through his work and discoveries he brought Marx closer to us and made him our living contemporary./

A vivid example of this is the Leninist theory of imperialism at the last stage in the development of capitalism. Marx analyzed the laws of development of the capitalist system of production on the material of the 19th century. Some of his ideas already anticipate the appearance of monopolies, state monopolies and so forth, particularly when the brilliant additions made by Engels are taken into consideration. Nevertheless, they are mainly based on the facts and processes characteristic of pre-monopolist capitalism.

Revisionists of the type of Bernstein and Kautskiy tried to "finish developing" (dorazvit) the Marxist idea to the point of the absurd conclusion that in the new circumstances under the conditions of imperialism the main idea of Marx, that of the necessity to accomplish a revolutionary transformation from the old system to the new one, loses its force. The fact that capitalism develops

into its monopolistic variety allegedly makes revolutionary struggle unnecessary.

It is the great fortune of mankind that the genius of Lenin's having created the theory of imperialism armed the workers class and the communist movement with the clear understanding of the fact that during the last stage of capitalism there strikes its final hour. Lenin demonstrated that even at the stage when monopolies are dominant the same--in principle--economic laws of historical development continue to operate as those that prevailed at the stage of pre-monopolist capitalism. Of course, their impact is modified. However, the essence of this modification is the growing number of objective prerequisites and the rising demand for social revolution and in the growing number of prerequisites for the collapse of capitalism and the victory of socialism. The triumph of the Great October Socialist Revolution was the first proof of this which was of universal-historic significance.

Lenin's ideas are those of Marx which are enriched and developed on a genuinely scientific basis, while taking into consideration the entire experience of social development in the post-Marx period. That is why we say that at present Marx is inconceivable without Lenin. That is why we now say /Marxism-Leninism./

Of course now in the year of Marx's anniversary the appeals to so to speak "purify" Marxism, to come back from Marxism that has allegedly been distorted by the followers of Marx and Engels to the allegedly true and genuine Marx--these appeals can sometimes be heard. What can be said in this regard?

In themselves the appeals to "go back to true Marxism" are not new, they were heard even at the end of the last century. It was precisely these appeals which were put forward by the first revisionists in history, starting with Bernstein. But what did their efforts amount to? They amounted to undermining the very foundation of Marxism and were far from "purifying" or "improving" it.

The present day "purifiers" of Marxism in fact pursue only one main aim: to separate Marx from Lenin and to "de-Leninize," so to speak, the workers movement. In other words this is the case of breaking the life-giving ties between the workers movement and the revolutionary science, ties which made the proletariat capable of accomplishing its historic mission. To disarm the workers class ideologically is the cherished dream of the class opponent.

Of course in this case the main blow is dealt to Lenin, because V.I. Lenin directly unmasked and nowadays continues to unmask imperialism as a threat to the future of mankind and oppose the strength of the people's masses headed by the international workers class and its Marxist-Leninist political vanguard to imperialist reaction.

The course of history and the real events of our time attest better than anything else to the fact that Marx and Lenin are inseparable. They represent one entity. This entity is and will always be the greatest property of the revolutionary forces and their common combat banner.

At present the powerful force of the /collective reason of the revolutionary workers movement/ is acting in the arena of world history. Our glorious party created by immortal Lenin is proud of belonging to this revolutionary force. Developing and deepening the theory created by Marx, Engels, and Lenin and on the basis of their experience, the forces of the new world and the future are implementing the behests of their great teachers.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1983

CSO: 1816/10a-F

RELEVANCE OF MARXISM TO CONTEMPORARY SOCIAL PROCESSES DEFENDED

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 5,
May 83 pp 21-36

[Article by A. Galkin: "Marx on the World-Historical Mission of the Working Class"--capitalized words published in boldface]

[Excerpts] Two-thirds of a century have elapsed since the time when the ideas formulated by the great Marx began to be embodied in life and the practice of the revolutionary creativity of the masses. Marx's genius was able to reveal behind the outward appearance of the felicitous ascent of capitalism in the period of its development which many people in the West continue to this day to term "golden" with the brilliance of the innovator-scientist its innermost secrets and point to the inexorability of its ultimate perdition. Marx proved and history has confirmed that the elimination of the final exploiter formation and capitalism's replacement by socialism is an objective revolutionary process whose inevitability is dictated by the fundamental laws of the development of human society.

However, history is not made "of its own accord," and the laws of social life manifest themselves differently than the laws of inanimate nature. Definite social forces are invariably the exponent of social progress; reaction, which opposes them also relies on this class, economic base or the other. Marx's greatest service is that he scientifically substantiated the historic role of the proletariat as the gravedigger of the old society and the creator of the new, contemporary and just society--the socialist system.

V.I. Lenin considered the ascertainment of the world-historical role of the proletariat as the main point in Marx's teaching.* Marx saw in the early protests of Europe's working class and the first attempts to storm the old world the contours of that invincible force and that social movement which would alone be capable of achieving man's liberation from all forms of exploitation, oppression and coercion. The contours of a truly universal movement united by the impassioned appeal "Workers of the world, unite!" and irresistibly proceeding along the path of its liberation mission.

* See V.I. Lenin, "Complete Works", vol 23, p 1.

The entire subsequent course of world development has confirmed the historical soundness of Marx. The victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution won under the leadership of the party of Bol'sheviks headed by V.I. Lenin--the brilliant thinker, follower and continuer of the cause of K. Marx and F. Engels--opened a new era in man's history: the era of the revolutionary renewal of the planet--the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of socialism--predicted by the founders of scientific socialism began. Today one-third of mankind is living and struggling under the banner of socialism. The workers movement in our day is the building of communism and socialism in the countries of victorious labor, the struggle for national liberation and the progressive socioeconomic development of former colonial and semicolonial countries and peoples and the spreading confrontation with state-monopoly capitalism in its own citadels. The modern movement of the proletariat is the material and ideological-political force of real socialism, the collective experience and wisdom of many dozen communist and workers parties worldwide and the growing recognition everywhere of the ideals and goals for which the working class is struggling as truly universal and solely and genuinely humane goals corresponding to the most urgent vital requirements of all people of labor.

In the foreword to the German edition of the "Communist Party Manifesto," which was written shortly after the death of K. Marx, F. Engels wrote, characterizing the basic thought which permeates this most important document of scientific socialism: it is a question of the fact "that economic production and the structure of the society of any historical era which inevitably ensues therefrom the basis of its political and intellectual history; that in accordance with this (since the time of the disintegration of primitive-commune land ownership), all history has been the history of class struggle, struggle between the exploited and the exploiters and subordinate and ruling classes at different stages of social development; and that now this struggle has reached a stage at which the exploited and oppressed class (the proletariat) can no longer free itself from the class exploiting and oppressing it (the bourgeoisie) without at the same time liberating all of society from exploitation, oppression and class struggle for always."* F. Engels deemed it necessary to emphasize here that the adduced "basic thought belongs entirely and exclusively to K. Marx."**

The teaching on the world-historical mission of the proletariat put forward by Marx is the logical result of an analysis of the regularities of social development and its driving forces at different stages. In turn this analysis is based on a theoretical disclosure of the nature, essence and dynamics of social-economic formations as a certain system of production relations. Marx substantiated the inevitability of the replacement of one antagonistic formation by another and revealed the specific mechanism of this process, showing that at the basis thereof is the contradiction between the level of development of the production forces which has been achieved and the nature of the production relations which is resolved in the course of acute class struggle--and ultimately--by means of social revolution. Not only

* K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works," vol 21, pp 1-2.

** Ibid.

thereby was a scientific explanation of man's entire preceding history given but his future was outlined and it was proven that the growth of the antagonistic contradictions of the bourgeois society and, primarily, the main one of these--between the social nature of production and the private-capitalist form of appropriation--would inevitably lead to its revolutionary transformation and the replacement of capitalism by socialism and communism.

The ideologists and defenders of capitalism and opportunists asserted, for example, that the working class could not be the social force capable of reorganizing society on new, sensible and humane lines inasmuch as, in representing the social masses, it is insufficiently educated and cultured, is fragmented and lacks a clearly expressed group consciousness and the proper degree of social and political assertiveness. The supporters of this viewpoint deliberately ignored Marx's indication that the role of the working class as the factor of social change is determined not only by its status at a given moment but also by what will inevitably become in the historical future. "The point is not what at a given moment this proletariat or other or the entire proletariat even SEES as his goal. The point is WHAT THE PROLETARIAT IS IN FACT and what, in keeping with this its SOCIAL BEING, will historically be compelled to do. Its goal and its historical cause are most clearly and incontestably pre-indicated by its own vital position, as, equally, by the entire organization of contemporary bourgeois society."*

K. Marx and F. Engels proceeded from the fact that the development of the working class is of a complex nature and proceeds in differentiated manner in different spheres. The quantitative growth of the proletariat occurs primarily. Right at the first phase of its existence as an independent social force it becomes from a negligible part of society a mass social group which is constantly reinforced by those originating in other classes and strata of society. It was to this aspect that attention was drawn by V.I. Lenin, who observed that in contrast with almost all the socialists of that time, who saw the proletariat merely as a "sore" and were thinking of how to halt its development, "...Marx and Engels placed all their hopes in the proletariat's continuous growth. The more proletarians, the greater their strength as the revolutionary class and the closer and more possible socialism."**

With the development of industry there is not only the numerical growth of the proletariat. "...It accumulates in great masses, its strength grows and it becomes increasingly aware of it."*** In other words, in line with its ongoing movement, capitalist production itself objectively facilitates the organization of the working class, initially production and subsequently class organization, on whose basis the conscious movement of the working class as a renewing, invigorating social force matures.

From the very outset Marx also raised the question of the necessity for securing

* K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works," vol 2, p 40.

** V.I. Lenin, "Complete Works," vol 2, p 6.

*** K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works," vol 4, p 432.

the organic unity of the revolutionary practice of the proletariat and revolutionary theory, which becomes a "material force as soon as it takes possession of the masses." "Like philosophy finds in the proletariat its MATERIAL weapon, the proletariat finds in philosophy its SPIRITUAL weapon."* In this connection Marx attached special significance to the intellectual growth of the working class.

The proletariat learns--in the broadest meaning of this word--primarily from the experience of its own struggle; its professional and general training is elevated under the impact of scientific-technical progress and the ongoing development of the production forces. However, the decisive role in the preparation of the working class for its performance of its world-historical mission is performed by the development of its class self-awareness. The founders of Marxism considered the creation of a combat political vanguard of the working class an essential condition of this. Communists, K. Marx and F. Engels wrote, "are in practice the most decisive part of the workers parties of all countries which is always prompting forward movement, and theoretically they have the advantage over the remaining mass of the proletariat in comprehension of the conditions, progress and general results of the proletarian movement."**

Counterposed to Marxist teaching on the historical mission of the working class is also another group of arguments whose purpose is to prove that, in spite of the forecasts of K. Marx and F. Engels, the working class not only does not strengthen its positions in social structures but, on the contrary, is dissolved in them, gradually disappearing as an independent social force. On the basis of such assertions there arose, for example, the so-called theory of a "growing middle class," representing a kind of quintessence of contemporary bourgeois and social reformist thought and its "heavy artillery" in the struggle against the teaching on the revolutionary role of the working class. The essence of this concept amounts to the fact that, allegedly, in the course of historical development the social polarization of society does not intensify, as follows from Marxist analysis, but, on the contrary, is overcome: the intermediate social groups are not eroded but reproduced on an expanded basis. In addition, a new social conglomerate sometimes called a "middle" and sometimes a "new middle class" is formed and grows, being replenished from other social groups. A system of values characterized by the acceptance in principle, with this reservation or the other, of the existing social system, satisfaction with its own position in society's social structure and extreme forms of consumer mentality is ascribed to it. This conglomerate allegedly determines and will continue to determine both the political and ideological development of society, the more so in that further structural changes will ultimately also "pull into" it the social groups which are as yet in terms of their position at opposite social poles.

A distorted interpretation of the Marxist approach to a determination of classes generally and the working class in particular constitutes the bases of

* K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works," vol 1, pp 422, 428.

** Ibid., vol 4, p 437.

this "construction". A knowingly oversimplified position in accordance with which the working class is identified with factory-plant workers employed in physical labor is attributed to Marx and Marxism as a whole. According to this "logic," all wage workers of nonphysical labor are mechanically excluded from the ranks of the working class. Thus the extension of the boundaries of the proletariat thanks to new professional and social groups is interpreted as its erosion and "absorption" by the growing "middle class".

How far this is from the true views of Marx, who never regarded the nature of labor as a class-forming characteristic. He always considered as the criterion making it possible to separate from the structure of society this class or the other the place occupied by a given social group in a certain system of social production. This position was reflected in full in an early definition of the proletariat given by K. Marx and F. Engels in the "Communist Party Manifesto": "By proletariat is understood the class of present-day wage workers who, deprived of their own means of production, are forced in order to live to sell their manpower."* Developing this thought, F. Engels wrote, "Social classes are at any moment the product of relations of production and exchange, in a word, the ECONOMIC relations of their era."**

The fundamental shifts in the alignment and correlation of class forces in the world arena created the prerequisites for the spread of a national liberation movement more organized and of a larger scale than in the prewar period. A process which led ultimately to the collapse of imperialism's colonial system and the appearance in the international arena of approximately 100 young independent states began.

Conditions for the struggle of the working class and the growth of the workers and general democratic movements more favorable than before took shape in many imperialist countries also thanks to the new alignment of political forces in the world and the increased influence of real socialism on the course of social development. They succeeded in having a number of important legislative measures enacted. Certain sectors of industry were nationalized and worker representation bodies were created (or recreated) at enterprises designed to limit the arbitrariness of the capitalists and the administration in certain countries under the influence of the working class. In the course of stubborn class struggle the proletariat achieved an increase in real wages, a reduction in the work day, a certain improvement in work conditions and social insurance and so forth. The political and professional organizations of the working class constituting in toto a highly influential economic and political force strengthened. Mass communist parties operate in many developed capitalist countries.

Thus more than a century of the development of the proletariat itself and its struggle against all forms of exploitation and oppression have dazzlingly confirmed the brilliant soundness of Marx's discovery. Despite all the distinctiveness of the processes of social differentiation in different countries and the class struggle in them and despite all the--sometimes

* K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works," vol 4, p 437.

** Ibid., vol 19, p 208.

difficult and tragic even--turnabouts and zigzags of this struggle, the general line of class confrontation has everywhere in the world been drawn precisely as K. Marx foresaw. The international working class has been the most mighty social force capable of ensuring the genuine progress of social development. It continues to perform this function today also; in addition, each new day of the battle for the revolutionary renewal of our planet and each successive step in the class struggle enhance the role and significance of the proletariat and its historical mission--the complete and final liberation of all mankind.

In the last 25 years the defenders of capitalism and the ideologists of reformism have been exerting particular efforts to persuade the working class of the developed capitalist states of its membership of the bourgeois "heights" and not the proletarian "lower reaches" of society. Such attempts were stepped up particularly in the 1960's, in a period of a relatively high rate of economic growth in the most developed capitalist countries, when the increase in GNP which had come about was used by monopoly capital to extend and intensify the strategy of social maneuvering. However, speculating on the well-known changes in the social structure of the leading capitalist countries occurring under the influence of the development of the production forces, the opponents of Marxism-Leninism are today also attacking not the true Marxist teaching on the working class but a crude falsification thereof fabricated by they themselves.

For a number of years now, for example, a pronounced place in the system of arguments designed to prove the "integration" of the working class in the capitalist system has been occupied by a references to the growing intellectualization of physical labor caused by contemporary industrial development. Extensive use is also made of the assertion that the automation process, conditioned by the scientific-technical revolution and substituting for a hierarchy of people a hierarchy of technological process, is eliminating the presence primarily in the minds of proletarians of the division into "us" (the oppressed) and "them" (the oppressors) and opening to the workers the possibility of "identifying" with the enterprise and the entrepreneur.

The proposition is also sometimes put forward that the migration of the rural population, which is being ruined, to the cities which is allegedly continuing in many bourgeois countries is leading to the domination of the "traditionally peasant" mentality over the proletarian mentality. According to this proposition, the worker of rural origins no longer aspires allegedly, as was the case in the past, to merge with the urban proletariat but regards his present status as transitional in the movement toward that of independent proprietor. Whence the conclusion that in the sectors and industrial areas where there is a broad stratum of workers of rural origins the proletarian mentality and system of values are allegedly being eroded from within and gradually disappearing. The process of intensive intracity migrations, when as a result of shifts in territorial settlement previously predominantly proletarian areas and worker communities are being superseded by communities with a heterogeneous composition of residents, is operating in the same direction, in the opinion of the supporters of the proposition concerning the "integration" of the working class. Finding themselves in different social surroundings, workers and the members of their families are subject to the influence of different forms and demands and allegedly draw increasingly close to the "middle class," as far as absolute fusion therewith.

However, true capitalist reality convincingly refutes such inventions. Despite the natural fluctuations of the intensiveness of the class struggle in different states of the Western world, the last decade was marked there as a whole by an increase therein. The growth of the number and duration of strikes and the number of their participants--according to official data even--the impressive victories of the forces of the left at local and national elections, the broadening of the social base of democratic movements, the appearance of new mass organizations and protests by the working people--all this is evidence of the intensification of the antimonopoly struggle. And whichever of the said phenomena we analyze more closely, each time it is revealed that ultimately the ideology and mentality of the organized proletariat impart to it inner strength and purposefulness, determine the forms, methods and means of struggle and influence most obviously its effectiveness. All this testifies by no means to the "embourgeoisement" of the working class and the working people of the capitalist countries but, on the contrary, to the proletarianization of the so-called "middle class" even. And objective data concerning the material position of the working people, including unemployment, which is growing "in breadth" and "in depth," confirm this conclusion. The social structure of the capitalist states has indeed undergone appreciable change in recent decades. However, the objective position therein of the working class and other categories of working people is determined, as before, so now also, by the system of production relations which has taken shape. The latter are constantly recreating a social situation wherein the working class, even having achieved certain, but essentially individual successes, again finds itself in the position of the slighted "masses".

The conclusion drawn by K. Marx that "both the production forces engendered by the contemporary capitalist mode of production and the system of distribution of benefits which it has created are in howling contradiction with this mode of production itself and to an extent, furthermore, that there has to be a revolution in the mode of production and distribution removing all class differences, lest all contemporary society be doomed to perdition,"* is even more pertinent today than over 100 years ago.

This contradiction is manifested particularly apparently when a period of relatively favorable economic conditions is replaced by a series of acute economic, social and political crises. It is this that has been observed since the latter half of the 1970's in all capitalist countries. Capitalism has entered a new period of social upheavals, the full dimensions of which are as yet difficult to foresee.

In the situation that has taken shape the monopoly bourgeoisie is attempting not only to heap onto the working class all the burdens of crisis development but to compel it to forgo a considerable proportion of the economic and social rights won in difficult struggle throughout the preceding decades. The proletariat has found itself confronted by harsh reality: declining employment and growing mass unemployment, which has extended to over 30 million persons in the developed capitalist countries, a decline in real wages, a

* K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works," vol 20, p 161.

down of the social security system and threats against the political rights of the working class.

Of course, it is no longer within the powers of the bourgeoisie to deprive the working class of its gains fully. Its influence and might are now such as to ensure that such attempts are doomed to failure in advance.

The working class numbered 780 million by the start of the 1980's. Of these, the industrially developed capitalist countries accounted for 265 million and the remaining nonsocialist countries for 250 million. Its share of the gainfully employed population of the first group of states constituted 75 percent and of the second 30 percent.* The professional organization of the working class has attained a high level. Whereas in 1920 there were 48 million trade union members in the world, including 39.8 million in the capitalist countries, on the threshold of the present decade there were 311.2 and 133.8 million respectively.**

Of course, the potential for an extension of the degree of organization of the working class is still far from exhausted. A trend toward a diminution in the numerical strength of the trade unions has been discerned in certain capitalist countries in recent years. This is connected to a certain extent with the fact that far from all unions are defending sufficiently resolutely and in combat fashion the interests of wage workers in the course of the resistance to capital. The strategy employed by the ruling class, which, alternating methods of direct coercion and concessions, is making extensive use in the struggle against the organized workers movement of a set of paternalist methods, is also playing its part. Despite all this, the trade unions have great power, which is designed to play an important part in the class battles, which are assuming a particularly bitter nature at the present stage of crisis development in the capitalist countries.

The political organization of the working class has achieved high indicators. Its revolutionary vanguard--the international communist movement--is operating actively in all parts of the world. There are now communist parties in 94 countries. Many of them have become mass organizations playing an appreciable part in political life. The influence of revolutionary workers parties continues to strengthen. In West Europe alone approximately 800,000 new fighters joined their ranks in the 1970's.

The structural shifts occurring in the ranks of the working class, influencing the correlation between individual detachments of the proletariat, do not alter its initial positions as a class in relation to the social system, for which it remains an object of exploitation. At the same time, however, in contributing to the increase in the proportion of intellectual labor these shifts are becoming an additional stimulus for a galvanization of the actions of the working class aimed at its emancipation and the assertion of its social interests.

* See L. Winter, "Das Proletariat in der Welt von Heute," Berlin, 1982, pp 72, 81.

** "Trade Unions and Society," Moscow, 1982, p 355.

The workers movement in the capitalist countries has accumulated considerable experience of the unification of the different forces opposed to monopoly capital. It affords an opportunity for drawing a number of conclusions concerning both the forms of such alliances and the methods of their realization. First, the creation of alliances is most successful in the process of mass struggle for direct socioeconomic and political demands. Second, an essential condition of the strength of the alliances is the workers movement's active defense of the specific interests of other nonexploiter social groups (persons of the free professions, petty proprietors, the student body and so forth, for example). Third, the new opportunities of alliances on the most important, political, level are connected with cooperation between the workers movement and all political parties and intraparty currents representing to this extent or the other the working people's masses and acting in defense of their interests. It is important here merely to avoid the danger of a loss of the proletarian parties' political character and the degeneration of a political alliance into an ordinary bosses' agreement.

The highest achievement of the proletariat's accomplishment of its world-historical mission is real socialism and the world socialist community. It is here that the working people's masses, guided by the combat vanguard--the communist and workers parties--have gone furthest along the path charted by Marx and his followers and achieved impressive results not only in liquidation of the system of exploitation and oppression but also in the creation of the new, communist future. It is here, in the process of the building of the socialist and communist society, that tasks of social development are being advanced in our day which were hitherto unprecedented and impossible in bourgeois countries, the path along which all mankind will ultimately proceed is being opened and the problems of genuine universal significance consonant with the aspirations and interests of all categories of working people are being solved.

This aspect of the world-historical mission of the working class was clearly reflected in the works of K. Marx, where a number of problems of a democratic nature was raised and solved. One of them, which acquired particular relevance at subsequent stages of the development of the international workers movement, was the correlation of the purely proletarian and the national liberation struggle. "...The victory of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie," K. Marx emphasized, "is simultaneously a signal for the liberation of all oppressed nations."* In the example of the unifying movement in Germany and Italy and the liberation struggle in Ireland and Poland the founders of Marxism-Leninism revealed a causal connection between the tasks of the social liberation of the proletariat as a class and the national self-determination of the peoples: there cannot be a free people which oppresses other peoples, as an oppressed class cannot liberate itself which tolerates and, even more, supports the oppression of others.

The victory of the socialist revolution in Russia, the successful solution of the national question in our country which had been bequeathed by the

* K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works," vol 4, p 371.

exploiter system and the building of a society of developed socialism based on Lenin's friendship of the peoples convincingly confirm the soundness and vitality of this most important proposition of Marxist-Leninist teaching. "The experience of the socialist solution of the national problem," Yu.V. Andropov observed, "is being attentively studied in dozens of countries which have freed themselves from colonial oppression. Our successes in socialist building, the historic victory over fascism and the burgeoning of the nations and nationalities of the Soviet Union have served as a powerful stimulus for the peoples' liberation struggle."

At the same time the question of the proletariat's role as the leading social factor of the transformation of international relations in universal interests was posed for the first time. The organic connection between the class interests of the workers and the nature of their influence on world politics was formulated by Marx in the "Constituent Manifesto of the International Workingmen's Association". "If the liberation of the working class," he wrote, "requires the fraternal cooperation of the workers (in the German text there is added: "of different countries"--A.G.), how can they perform this great task given the existence of a foreign policy which, pursuing criminal goals, plays on national prejudices and in wars of plunder sheds the blood and squanders the wealth of the people?"* The real development of international relations indicates "to the working class its duty--itself mastering the secrets of international politics, following the diplomatic activity of its governments and, if necessary, counteracting it with all the means at its disposal; in the event of it being impossible to prevent this activity, uniting for the simultaneous exposure thereof and striving to ensure that the simple laws of morality and justice by which private individuals should be guided in their mutual relations become the highest laws in relations between peoples also.

"The struggle for such a foreign policy constitutes part of the overall struggle for the liberation of the working class."**

Of course, at that stage it could only have been a question of hope. It took many decades of the persistent and difficult struggle of the proletariat, its conquest of political power first in one country and subsequently in a number of countries and the conversion of its interests and aspirations into the foreign policy of the socialist community for the position of the working class on foreign policy issues to become an important factor of the formation of the entire system of international relations. The first enactment of Soviet power was the Decree on Peace, which was signed by Lenin and which declared imperialist war "the greatest crime against mankind." The struggle for peace and the prevention of war is the core of socialism's foreign policy. This is manifested particularly graphically today, when counterposed to the aggressive policy of imperialism, which is fraught with the threat of the extermination of everything living on earth, as a most important obstacle is the peace-loving strategy of the Soviet Union and the other countries of real socialism which proceed from the fact that "there are no problems,

* K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works," vol 16, p 11.

** Ibid.

world or regional, which cannot be justly solved by peaceful means."* This position is being supported increasingly actively by mass movements of working people in the nonsocialist part of the world.

K. Marx, brilliant scholar and great revolutionary, devoted his entire life to ensuring that the science which he had created became a means of the liberation of the working class. Having formulated the teaching on the world-historical mission of the working class, he found the "fulcrum" which makes it possible to turn "upside-down" the world of economic and political oppression. All subsequent history has confirmed the truth of his discovery. Marx's forecast of the role of the working class, which has proven in practice its capacity for being the political, moral and intellectual engine of historical progress and has scored impressive achievements on this path, has fully justified itself.

Much has changed in the world and in the workers movement itself in the past 150 years. But today also "the international working class is the main driving force of the revolutionary struggle and the entire democratic and anti-imperialist movement."** The essence of the proletariat's liberation mission and its historical purpose remain those as defined by K. Marx, manifesting themselves in our time to an increasingly great extent. And there are no forces in the world which can halt or turn back the victory march of the international proletariat, just as there is no force capable of breaking the will of the peoples in the struggle for a genuinely human society of people of liberated labor on our planet.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1983.

8850

CSO: 1816/10

* "Warsaw Pact Political Declaration," PRAVDA 7 January 1983.

** "Eightieth Anniversary of the Second Russian Social Democratic Workers Party Congress," CPSU Central Committee decree, PRAVDA 5 April 1983.

U.S. 'PSYCHOLOGICAL WARFARE' AGAINST USSR ASSAILED

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 5,
May 83 pp 37-48

[Article by G. Sogomonyan: "The New 'Crusade': Ideology and Practice"]

[Excerpts] The intensification of the general crisis of capitalism, the narrowing of the sphere of imperialist domination in the world and the further strengthening of the positions of the forces of world socialism and social progress--all this has caused an extremely painful reaction on the part of the most aggressive circles of imperialism, primarily American. It is expressed in the policy of undermining detente, complicating the international situation and spurring military hysteria. As the 26th CPSU Congress emphasized, there has also been a marked exacerbation of the ideological struggle in the international arena. In this atmosphere, Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, observes, "There has been a stirring in the West of the most bellicose groupings, whose class hatred of socialism is gaining the ascendancy over a sense of reality and sometimes simply over commonsense."

A manifestation of this process was the new "crusade" against communism and essentially against all the forces of peace, democracy and social liberation which has been proclaimed by Washington. The main target of this adventurist policy is the Soviet Union, its sociopolitical system, our country's domestic and foreign policy and its ideology.

Ideology and Foreign Policy Practice--Two Approaches

Washington's proclamation of the latest crusade, which has been elevated by the U.S. Administration to the rank of official strategy and policy, has again put on the agenda the question of the correlation of foreign policy practice and ideology.

Of course, the ideological struggle in the international arena and in individual capitalist countries is not something transient, being an expression of the fundamental class contradictions between capitalism and socialism and the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. The position of the CPSU, as of other Marxist-Leninist parties also, on this problem is well known. It was confirmed anew in Comrade Yu.V. Andropov's speech at the CPSU Central Committee November (1982) Plenum: "The CPSU is opposed to the dispute of ideas

becoming a confrontation between states and peoples and to weapons and the readiness to resort to them as a yardstick of the potentialities of the social systems."

In accordance with this approach, the socialist community countries oppose "psychological warfare," which is incompatible with the principles of peaceful coexistence. These principles are also enshrined in many documents of international law. Socialist diplomacy proceeds from the fact that no negotiations should become confrontations and disputes concerning the advantages of this ideology or the other. Even more impermissible is to use interstate relations for flagrant interference in other countries' internal affairs.

We do not conceal the fact that our entire creative activity is determined by Marxist-Leninist ideology. While sure of its truth and historical soundness, the socialist states have never advanced and are not now advancing demands for our class adversaries' transition to positions of Marxist-Leninist theory and the principles of the sociopolitical structure of the socialist countries. This issue, which, it would seem, is clear to any statesman, has again become pertinent today. This is why the Warsaw Pact countries demand it necessary to stress in the Prague Political Declaration: "Aware of the responsibility for the cause of peace and international security," they declared, "the socialist countries strictly separate in their policy ideological questions from problems of interstate relations, build their relations with the capitalist states on the basis of peaceful coexistence and consistently advocate extensive cooperation with the developing countries. The cooperation of states, irrespective of their social system, corresponds to the interests of all peoples and the vital requirement of the strengthening of universal peace."

And how are the organizers of the new crusade operating? Having adopted a policy of undermining detente and acting the part of investigators of a new world war, they are attempting to make the pivot of interstate relations the ideology of bellicose anticommunism and anti-Sovietism and striving for the extermination of the socialist system, which marks the highest stage in man's development.

In his typically off-hand manner Reagan and, in his wake, other high representatives of the U.S. Administration, having lost all sense of reality are declaring their intention "to do away with socialism as a world system,"

"write off communism as a strange, unnatural phenomenon in man's history" and "cast Marxism-Leninism on the garbage heap of history."* A principal ideological mentor of the U.S. Administration, R. Pipes, actually delivers the ultimatum: either the Soviet Union abandons its present system or it can expect war. Even many bourgeois press organs are highly critical of this form of the "re-ideologization of East-West relations."**

* DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN July 1982, p 28; THE NEW YORK TIMES 30 May 1982.

** See AUS POLITIK UND ZEITGESCHICHTE 18 August 1981, p 53.

Obviously, we are faced with an unconcealed aspiration to poison the international atmosphere and erase the boundaries between normal diplomatic meetings and negotiations which are generally accepted in international practice and propaganda performances in the spirit of the worst traditions of the cold war.

It is significant that all the official documents adopted by NATO Council sessions in recent years contain to a greater extent than ever before an entire collection of contrived declamation on the one hand glorifying Western "values" and, on the other, slanderously distorting the sociopolitical system of the socialist countries. What is the value here of the thoroughly hypocritical assertions concerning the need for the observance of individual countries' sovereignty accompanied by impudent "demands" on and prescriptions for the socialist countries on how to organize their life and their political and social institutions?

Thus in their anticommunist, antisocialist and reactionary strategy the aggressive forces of imperialism regard the ideological struggle not simply as a struggle of ideas but as the most unconcealed psychological warfare.

It is fitting in this respect to draw attention to the unprecedented efforts of the U.S. Administration in terms of "improving" and expanding the machinery for the introduction of psychological warfare and the mobilization of huge resources for this purpose. From which sources? Clearly, the resources of U.S. big shots, for whom the policy of militarization is truly a goldmine, serve as such sources. It is well known that both the administration itself and the highest machinery of the administration ("Reagan's ruling class," as the Americans call it) are literally inundated with millionaires. The federal institutions and "research" centers which serve as an "ideas' mill" for the White House are the creation of the military-industrial complex. These centers are the Rand Corporation, Stanford University's Hoover Institute of War, Revolution and Peace, Georgetown University's Center for Strategic and International Studies in Washington, the American Enterprise Institute, the Heritage Foundation, the California Institute of Contemporary Studies and others. Many figures of the present administration either came originally from these centers or are constantly collaborating with them (G. Bush, E. Meese, R. Allen, F. Ikle and so forth).

The foreign policy propaganda machinery has been appreciably reorganized under Reagan. Its reorganization was begun under Carter, but, in the opinion of the present leaders, more radical measures and considerably greater resources are needed for the performance of the tasks entrusted to this machinery. While spending on social programs is being cut back sharply, appropriations for foreign policy propaganda alone, which rose to \$1 billion during the previous administration's term of office, have risen to \$2.5 billion annually.

In 1978 the USIA, which had functioned since the time of the cold war unleashed by American imperialism, was transformed into the ICA and became a principal center of the psychological warfare against the forces of peace, democracy and socialism, primarily the USSR and the other socialist community countries. Last September, on President Reagan's instructions, the ICA was again named the USIA. At the start of the present decade the budget of this department constituted more than \$640 million and the staff 7,800. In 1982 it had

offices in 126 countries and published 12 journals in 22 languages. Also at its disposal is VOA, which conducts propaganda broadcasts to dozens of countries. Two other, essentially sabotage, radio stations--Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe (Munich)--are formally under the jurisdiction of the Council for International Broadcasting, but in practice their activity is controlled by the CIA.

A new coordinating center--a special cabinet-level committee headed by W. Clark, the President's national security adviser--was set up in January 1983. The committee is made up of a number of high-ranking figures--Secretary of State G. Shultz, Defense Secretary C. Weinberger and USIA Director C. Wick. This psychological warfare body has been entrusted with "propaganda planning," coordination of efforts for "counteracting the Soviet peace offensive" and the formulation of recommendations for combating the antiwar movement in the United States and beyond.*

A certain compact between the United States, Britain, the FRG and other NATO powers has been created in the psychological warfare field. In May 1980 Britain's Prime Minister M. Thatcher declared the intention of deploying against the "spread of communism" a concentrated propaganda campaign such as we have not yet undertaken.** A special coordinating center operates under the auspices of the North Atlantic bloc's headquarters in Brussels which draws up "recommendations" concerning the basic directions of psychological warfare, concocts "arguments" on many specific issues of subversive propaganda, publishes periodicals, books and brochures and organizes symposia and conferences. The so-called North Atlantic Treaty Association, which is not formally a NATO body but is closely linked with it, discusses at its annual assemblies not only military-political but also ideological problems, subordinating these discussions to the tasks of struggle against the cause of peace and social progress. Questions of psychological warfare occupy a place of considerable importance at meetings of such "unofficial organizations" as the Trilateral Commission and the Bilderberg Club. The periodic meetings of the seven biggest capitalist countries, including the latest, in Paris, which are formally devoted to economic issues, in fact also represent an attempt to coordinate the capitalist countries' actions in the political sphere also and to seek ways of "safeguarding democratic values" in the form in which they are understood by bourgeois politicians and ideologists.***

Of course, the tune in this hostile, anticommunist and antisocialist activity is called by aggressive U.S. circles and their foreign policy propaganda bodies. This dirty "work" attained new proportions with the establishment by the CIA leadership on the President's instructions of a plan of ideological-sabotage actions under the name of "Truth" (August 1981). It would be more correct to name this project "Lie" or "Slander". Judging by the statements of present USIA Director C. Wick and press reports, its essence is determined by two basic interconnected components--shameless slander in respect of the foreign policy and sociopolitical system of the USSR and unbridled defense of the "American

* See THE NEW YORK TIMES 20 January 1983.

** Quoted from THE MORNING STAR 5 May 1980.

*** See, for example, the final communique of the meeting of the Seven in Paris (L'HUMANITE 7 June 1982).

way of life" and also the "new policy" of the Reagan administration.

Psychological Warfare in Action

To President R. Reagan belong the words: "We must unhesitatingly proclaim our ultimate goals and take concrete action to achieve them."* Internationally these goals are the establishment of American imperialism's world domination. R. Allen, former U.S. presidential national security adviser (now political adviser to the ruling Republic Party), who was forced to resign his position following exposure of his financial machinations, declared without beating about the bush: "Our aim is to restore the leading role of the United States of America." His successor in this post, W. Clark, disclosed the heart of the matter even more clearly: the West must "defend its interests and channel the world's development in the necessary direction."**

According to the inspirers and organizers of the crusade, detente in the 1970's was not "genuine" in the same sense that it impeded a realization of the West's class priorities, in other words, prevented, from these circles' viewpoint, more effective anticommunist, anti-Soviet propaganda being conducted. In an interview with LE MONDE the U.S. ambassador to France claimed that detente only "caused confusion" since owing to East-West cultural and commercial-economic relations and also disarmament negotiations, "people (in the West--G.S.) forget the true nature of the USSR."***

The slanderous proposition that the USSR used detente to achieve one-sided superiority over the USSR and NATO, as a result of which a "Soviet military threat" to the West has arisen, is being played up persistently for ideological and political "substantiation" of the policy of doing away with detente and spurring international tension. The reference is to the allegedly increased possibility of the USSR's "aggression" or, at least, the Soviet Union's political pressure on the NATO countries, primarily the West European countries. Thus N. Podhoretz, chief editor of the American journal COMMENTARY, which is known for its rightwing views, hysterically calls on the Washington administration to "do something to halt the decline of our strength--military, economic and political." He makes it understood here that war should not be feared for the sake of accomplishing these goals. "I," Podhoretz declares in the wake of Haig, "am not a pacifist and am of the opinion that there are things for the sake of which it is worth fighting and dying." The experience of the detente of the 1970's he considers "disillusioning" for the West and calls the USSR the "main enemy," which, "in accordance with the internal dynamics of its system," inevitably aspires to an "expansionist foreign policy."****

As far as the accusations against the USSR of an endeavor to change the military-strategic parity to its advantage are concerned, there has been a manifest confusion of the addresses here. It is the United States and not the Soviet Union which is making an avowed gamble on the achievement of

* DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN July 1982, p 27.

** IPW-BERICHT No 5, 1982, p 57.

*** LE MONDE 25 May 1982.

**** See DER SPIEGEL 16 August 1982, pp 107-109.

military superiority, which official representatives of the U.S. Administration are declaring for all to hear. U.S. Presidential Adviser E. Meese acknowledged in a speech on 18 August 1981 that the American nuclear program for the 1980's is aimed at establishing "the United States' strategic superiority over the Soviet Union in the course of 10 years."* What precisely the Reagan administration's policy consists of here is also openly indicated in the foreign policy part of the President's traditional annual State of the Union report to the U.S. Congress. U.S. strategy, it emphasizes, "should be based on strength--on economic strength and military strength." A vast program of the "rearming of America" was confirmed here on which in the coming 5 years it is proposed spending the astronomical sum of \$1.6 trillion.

Of course, such a policy obliges the Soviet Union to observe vigilance and to strengthen its security. As emphasized at the 26th CPSU Congress and in the speeches of Yu.V. Andropov, the USSR will not permit anyone to create superiority over it.

Even in the 1970's, in the period of detente's biggest achievements, bourgeois ideologists and politicians put forward the proposition according to which detente must not, they said, mean recognition of the sociopolitical status quo in the world. "We would like," R. Allen declared in an interview with the West German newspaper DIE ZEIT, "to prompt the Soviet Union to act less as a revolutionary power and more as a state conscious of its responsibility."** In other words, it is a question of the USSR and its allies abandoning the support of peoples struggling for their national liberation and social progress and affording imperialism a "free hand" in vast regions of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

Allen and his ilk cannot be denied a certain constancy. They are certified anticommunists with a lengthy term of service. Thus back in the 1960's the same Allen submitted his thesis for doctor of sciences at Munich University. The subject of the thesis was "Theory and Practice of the Liberation of People From Marxism-Leninism". As can be seen, the title speaks for itself. It is significant that even respectable "Sovietologists" from the university, who harbor no sympathies toward Marxism-Leninism merely by nature of their occupations, turned down the thesis as "too primitive". Alas, they "underestimated" the author. For the same "theoretical discoveries" made by the candidate in the 1960's have been adopted by the present-day "crusaders". Allen asserted, for example, that for the communists peaceful coexistence is simply "the strategy of communist revolution aimed at the final overthrow of the free world and the establishment of world communist domination." No more no less. And now, at the start of the 1980's, paraphrasing one of his mentors somewhat, the chief of the White House would have people believe in all seriousness that, as follows from the material of CPSU congresses, the Soviet Union aspires in detente merely to establish a "single socialist or communist state."***

* Quoted from IPW-BERICHT No 5, 1982, p 58.

** DIE ZEIT 11 September 1981.

*** EUROPA-ARCHIV No 5, 1981, p D162.

Of course, in attributing such aspirations to the USSR the head of the present U.S. Administration does not trouble himself with any proof, which is easily explicable: there simply is none. Of course, we do not suppose that Reagan has had the time to ever familiarize himself with CPSU documents or Lenin's works. Yet back in 1918 V.I. Lenin sharply criticized the "prompting revolution" theory, emphasizing that it "would be at total variance with Marxism."*

It is not the communists and not the Soviet Government but, on the contrary, reactionary imperialist circles which are striving to do away with the social and state system of other states, the socialist states primarily. It is they who are systematically conducting hostile campaigns against the countries building a new society or which have opted for a path of progressive social transformations and discrediting and distorting everything that is occurring in them, attempting thereby to turn people away from socialism altogether.

It is significant that the ideologists of imperialism, Americans particularly, openly reject the previous theories of the "convergence" of the two systems as being, in their opinion, unduly passive and counting on "overcoming socialism merely on the basis of this internal factor or the other. What are needed, they argue, are vigorous, purposeful, assertive actions in respect of the socialist community countries. The same R. Pipes declared at the start of 1982: "We cannot expect Soviet communism to disappear of its own accord. If this is to occur, this has to be facilitated." He is echoed by the President's National Security Adviser W. Clark: "We cannot sit with our arms folded in the hope that all our wishes will come about of their own accord. We must display initiative and perseverance. We must be ready to respond vigorously to any opportunity which presents itself and ourselves create opportunities where previously they were lacking."**

And they are not, as is known, sitting "with arms folded," operating increasingly subtly and insidiously for the purpose of undermining socialism and the socialist community. The provocations against people's Poland are a sufficiently eloquent illustration of these methods. Here the opponents of socialism, arrant counterrevolutionaries closely connected with the West's special services, primarily the CIA, given the support and leadership of imperialist circles, endeavored, creating anarchy, to turn the development of events into a counterrevolutionary channel. Imperialist propaganda portrayed the counterrevolutionary extremists as "Fighters for freedom" and "reformism" and supported them financially. The sabotage radio centers, particularly Liberty and Free Europe, gave detailed instructions on how to operate to introduce chaos, undermine the PZPR and the state, restore bourgeois practices and remove Poland from the Warsaw Pact. Essentially, Poland, in the plans of imperialist strategists, was to have become a kind of proving ground for aggressive and reactionary operations which, if successful, would have had far-reaching consequences. As Comrade W. Jaruzelski declared at a session of the Polish Sejm in January 1982, "it was proposed on Polish soil to begin the

* V.I. Lenin, "Complete Works," vol 35, p 403.

** See IPW-BERICHT No 5, 1982, p 59; PRAVDA 24 May 1982.

process of demolition of the postwar alignment of forces in Europe and thereby on a world scale. In the endeavor to destabilize and achieve a one-sided preponderance hopes were placed on destruction of the foundation of peace in Europe as represented by the Yalta and Potsdam agreements."*

It is not fortuitous that in recent years imperialist propaganda, as if on command, has stepped up sharply its attacks on these agreements, distorting their true historical meaning and portraying matters such that they, primarily the Yalta agreements, represent a partition of Europe which has allegedly served as the source of all the troubles in the world. Reaction is not embarrassed by the fact that both the FRG's treaties with the USSR and other socialist countries and the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference proceed from the results of the postwar settlement in Europe, of which the Yalta and Potsdam agreements are the basis.

The rights for all working people about which man had dreamed for centuries--the right to work, education, social security, free medical assistance, recreation, housing, equal pay for women and others--have not only been proclaimed but are guaranteed in practice in the USSR. Socialist democracy is built on the basis of the masses' increasingly extensive participation in state and social affairs.

What can the ideologists and politicians of present-day capitalism counterpose to these achievements of real socialism? A profound economic crisis, tens of millions of unemployed living on pitiful compensation or lacking wherewithal altogether, inflation, a sharp cutback in social programs condemning broad strata of the population of the capitalist states to a further decline in the living standard, crime, which has assumed unprecedented proportions, mass drug addiction and other social "evils"? Considering the real state of affairs in these countries, we should not be surprised that the U.S. President's address to the British Parliament, in which he discredited the USSR in every possible way and endeavored to prove the unprovable, namely, that it is not the West but the socialist countries which are experiencing a crisis, was, according to the Swiss newspaper NEUE ZUERCHER ZEITUNG, received "without interest" by the members of parliament are not accustomed to being presented with such tirades against the Soviet Union with not a word said about the shortcomings in their own camp.** The word "shortcomings" has, of course, too mild a ring with respect to the problems being encountered by capitalism, and not only in the economic but in other spheres of social life, furthermore.

How much ink has been wasted and how many crocodile tears shed apropos the so-called "national problem" in the USSR! And this in respect of a country one of whose greatest achievements is the unparalleled solution of the national question, a country where all forms of national oppression and discrimination have been done away with and where the vision of the founders of Marxism-Leninism about the fact that "only an awakening proletariat can establish fraternity between different nations"*** has been realized in practice.

* PRAVDA 27 January 1982.

** NEUE ZUERCHER ZEITUNG 10 June 1982.

*** K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works," vol 2, p 590.

The indestructibility of the international brotherhood of all the Soviet peoples and nationalities has been demonstrated repeatedly in periods of grave trials, in the war years and in the period of peaceful creative labor. What a contrast against this background is made by the situation in the sphere of international relations in the capitalist world, particularly in the United States, where an orgy of facism and chauvinism is observed and the national minorities' elementary rights are flouted.

The contrast between the two courses is manifested in no less relief in the attitude toward the national liberation movement in the world. While the USSR and other socialist countries are rendering the peoples fighting for the independence and social progress all-around support and developing cooperation with the emerging states on the basis of the principles of equality and non interference in their internal affairs reactionary, aggressive imperialist circles are attempting to halt the course of history and suppress the national liberation movement with all the means at their disposal. Essentially imperialism has declared a crusade not only against communism and real socialism but also against all the forces opposed to it in the international arena.

The present attitude of the crusaders toward the national liberation movement is perhaps best characterized by the fact that it is regarded by them as the source and manifestation of so-called "international terrorism," which is allegedly financed and directed by Moscow and its allies and friends. For example, speaking in West Berlin, the not unknown A. Haig, while U.S. secretary of state, asserted: "Phrases about 'national liberation' are used to justify international terrorism and violence."* Thus from the viewpoint of U.S. ruling circles and their placement and partners, all true fighters for independence and social progress are terrorists. The Israeli fascists, on the other hand, who are pursuing a policy of genocide in respect of an entire people, unrepentant Somocistas operating against the Nicaraguan revolution and mercenary killers dispatched to African countries by the South African racists are presented as none other than zealous supporters of democracy and "freedom fighters."

Preparing for a further expansion of aggressive, terrorist activity, the U.S. Administration has embarked on knocking together special sabotage detachments (there is already a "command" for special military operations). They are designed for subversive operations against many countries. Besides combat units, this command is being assigned special subunits whose mission is to conduct psychological warfare and "civil actions," that is, organize counterrevolutionary demonstrations. This is real and not imaginary "international terrorism" in practice.

In October 1982 the U.S. State Department convened a special "international" conference to discuss "ways of changing the structure of communist countries." The conference was of a semi-private nature, but even individual facts which filtered through to the American press show that provocative and impudent actions

* DIE WELT 14 September 1981.

In respect of other countries, particularly the socialist countries, have become the standard behavior of U.S. official bodies even. U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz acted as principal speaker at the conference. Referring to the activity of various counterrevolutionary elements and all kinds of renegades from the socialist countries (some of these persons were present at the conference), Shultz claimed that a "new era of democratic reforms and revolutions" is imminent in the socialist countries and that it is the business of the United States and its "moral and strategic duty" to assist this process and facilitate the "transformation" of the socialist countries, that is, the restoration of bourgeois practices.* These adventurist plans show eloquently how far certain imperialist circles have gone in violation of all the recognized rules of international law.

This conference had hardly concluded before, in November 1982, a new such gathering was convened--an "International Conference on Free Elections". Its participants outlined further operations of an antisocialist and antidemocratic nature. Subversive activity against other states assumed an even greater scale following the U.S. State Department's publication at the start of this year of "Program of Democracy and Public Diplomacy". As the State Department document makes clear, it was drawn up in development of the goals expounded by President Reagan in his address to the British Parliament in June 1982. It is a question of plans for unconcealed interference in other states' internal affairs to be effected with the aid of a kind of "fifth column" of American imperialism. The training of "executive personnel" from among people ready to serve the interests of American monopolies and the allocation of large-scale financial resources intended for U.S. agents' penetration of parties, trade unions, business circles, religious organizations, administrative bodies and the policy apparatus are envisaged for this purpose. Measures are also planned to expand the "targets" of the propaganda-ideological provocations and CIA "secret operations" to enhance the effectiveness of "public diplomacy".

Within the framework of Washington's implementation of the crusade against communism a place of considerable importance is also occupied by its sabotage aimed at undermining the world communist movement and the endeavor to strike at the foundations of proletarian internationalism and the unity and cohesion of the communists of all countries. This is entirely "logical" since proletarian internationalism is a main principle of Marxism-Leninism and a mighty and proven weapon of the communist parties and of the workers movement generally in the implacable struggle against imperialism and reaction.

An inability and unwillingness to come to terms with actual reality, the changed correlation of forces in the world and the main trends of social development--this is what determines the present actions of the organizers of the latest crusade. There is no doubt that it will end in the same failure as previous ones. "It is given to no one," Yu.V. Andropov declared in the report "Sixty Years of the USSR," "to turn back the course of historical development. The attempts to 'stifle' socialism failed even at the time when the Soviet state had only just learned to stand and was the world's sole socialist country. How much less will come of this now."

FOOTNOTE: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye sheniya". 1983.

SOVIET, U.S. STANDS ON NONUSE OF NUCLEAR ARMS CONTRASTED

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 5,
May 83 pp 49-59

[Article by V. Petrovskiy: "Important Problem of International Politics"]

[Excerpts] Upon the appearance of nuclear weapons the Soviet Union declared immediately that the very existence of such weapons and, even more, the probability of their use was a historically unparalleled mortal threat to the peoples and should be removed. "Back when the ruins left by World War II were still fresh...", USSR Foreign Minister A.A. Gromyko observed in response to questions of a PRAVDA correspondent on 24 February 1983, "the Soviet Union proposed that the use of nuclear weapons be declared incompatible with the conscience of mankind and that nuclear weapons be banned for all time and destroyed. This was a step on the part of the Soviet state of outstanding significance which implanted in people's hearts the hope that the tragedy which the world had only just experienced would not befall it again."

This clear, sharp and specific formulation of the question of the danger of nuclear war and the need for its prevention and subsequent exclusion from the life of society manifested with great force the humanist nature of the international policy of the world's first socialist state.

Having made the task of removing the nuclear danger the cornerstone, the USSR engaged in assertive foreign policy activity in all areas for the purpose of accomplishing it. In the field of international law it advocated the creation of a system of commitments excluding the use of force, primarily in its nuclear form, and the settlement of conflicts and crises by way of negotiation; in the military-political field a halt to and the turning back of the nuclear arms race which had begun and which was rapidly gathering pace; and in the moral-psychological field the renunciation of any propaganda of war and saber-rattling.

The Soviet Union's unilateral commitment in 1982 not to be the first to use nuclear weapons was perceived throughout the world as a step of historic significance. It is thus that it is characterized by a resolution specially passed by the UN General Assembly 37th Session. It contains an appeal to the other nuclear powers to follow this example, which would be an appreciable measure in the prevention of nuclear war.

Today the Soviet Union is the world's sole nuclear power which has assumed the precise and clear commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons.

It should be emphasized that it is not the first time that the question of no first use of nuclear weapons has been raised by Soviet diplomacy, and on each occasion it has been put forward with regard for the specific political situation in the world.

On the even and at the outset of the 1980's aggressive imperialist circles, primarily in the United States, departed from the policy of detente and the letter and spirit of the agreements contained within its framework and adopted a policy of disrupting the military balance and achieving for themselves positions of transcendent military strength.

The program of the development and production of nuclear weapons and also weapons based on the latest scientific achievements and discoveries, including systems and facilities for conducting combat operations in space and from space, which were recently adopted and which are already being implemented by Washington and which are designed to multiply many times over the power of destruction of the U.S. military arsenal, are leading to a disruption of international stability. These programs are inseparably connected with the advancement of strategic concepts and doctrines--"disarming nuclear first strike," "limited nuclear war" and others--based on the calculation that it is possible by first use of nuclear weapons to win a thermonuclear war.

According to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), the military-technical demands being made in the United States on the waging of a "limited" nuclear war are in fact analogous to those which have to be secured for delivering a preventive strike. It is essentially a question of legalizing the use of nuclear weapons and switching from threats and blackmail with these weapons to launching them. At the same time the United States has suspended a number of disarmament negotiations. It is now using the continuing negotiating forums not for the sake of reaching agreements but for discussions which might serve as a "lightning conductor" in the storm of the public's antinuclear demonstrations in the countries of the West, including the United States itself. Under these conditions the question of no first use of nuclear weapons has acquired additional urgency as a most important measure which should be adopted immediately to extricate the peoples from the threat of nuclear war.

Endeavoring to mobilize peace-loving states and the public for the accomplishment of this task, the USSR submitted for examination by the UN General Assembly 36th Session as an important and urgent question "Preventing Nuclear Catastrophe. Declaration of the UN General Assembly". A proposal on the solemn proclamation that states and statesmen resorting to first use of nuclear weapons would be perpetrating the most heinous crime against mankind constituted the core of the draft declaration submitted by the Soviet Union. The draft was supported by the majority of UN members--socialist and nonaligned--including India, Algeria, Yugoslavia, Mexico, Ethiopia, Nigeria, Tanzania, Syria, Iraq, Libya, Guyana, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Mozambique, Peru, Venezuela, Ecuador and others. Only the United States and its military-political bloc allies--only 19 countries--were opposed.

The voting showed convincingly "who's who" on the question of no first use of nuclear weapons. The approval of a most important political document, which is intended to have a long-term salutary impact on the development of the situation in the world, was the result. The declaration points to a simple and clear way of lessening the nuclear threat--renouncing first use of nuclear weapons. After all, if there is no "first" nuclear strike, there will be no "second" and subsequent nuclear strikes, and, consequently, a world thermonuclear catastrophe will not erupt.

The adoption of the declaration was a serious warning to the supporters of the policy of a nuclear arms buildup and the implementation of wide-ranging strategic rearmament programs and all those who are putting forward the insane doctrines of the "possibility" and "acceptability" of nuclear war. All such doctrines and actions, which are pushing the world toward catastrophe, are repudiated in the document as contrary to the laws of human morality and the lofty ideals of the United Nations.

The declaration emphasizes that the grounds and motives and circumstances and situations which could afford states the right to first use of nuclear weapons do not and cannot exist. Here is the voice of man's very conscience warning that there will never be either justification or forgiveness for the figures who might decide on the first use of nuclear weapons. The declaration is intended to constantly remind statesmen who, by virtue of their position, have to deal with a solution of the question of the use of nuclear weapons that each of them is personally responsible for the fate of mankind.

This aspect attracted the particular attention of the participants in the General Assembly. A number of delegations supported the opinion expressed on behalf of the Soviet Union that, despite clashes of interests and disagreements, however, serious, a considered, prudent approach to the solution of acute international problems should invariably prevail in the action of the top political leaders. The declaration contains an appeal to the leaders of all the nuclear powers that they act such as to reduce to nothing the danger of the outbreak of a nuclear conflict.

These propositions are also of significance particularly because they repudiate a variety of apologetic arms race theories which prove that the latter develops by virtue of its own inertia and as a result of the continuous changes in military technology. Thus, for example, the appearance of the technical potential for increasing missile warheads' strike accuracy is given as the reason for a switch to the "counterforce" doctrine, that is, the actual preparation of a first, "disarming" strike against the hardened missile launch silos and other military targets of the "enemy". Or, say, the successes in the conquest of space are allegedly leading to the creation of weapons which defend against a retaliatory strike. It is obvious that the purpose of such arguments amounts to compelling the peoples to reconcile themselves to the development of an arms race of unprecedented scale and to abandon the struggle against the military threat. The declaration adopted on the USSR's initiative emphasizes that the responsibility for all this will be borne by entirely specific organizations and people and that political will is needed to remove the danger of war. Arms and doctrines of their use are created by people, and people can and must renounce them.

Recognition of the impermissibility of first use of nuclear weapons should be regarded, according to the provisions of the declaration on the prevention of nuclear catastrophe, as a kind of launch pad for the stimulation of efforts in all areas leading to the inadmissibility and ultimately removal of the threat of nuclear war. For this reason the document includes the following provision: the arms race should be halted and turned back by joint efforts by way of honest and equal negotiations in order that the energy of the atom be used only for peaceful purposes and only for the good of mankind and not for the production of means of destruction.

The Soviet Union's formulation in strong and at the same time maximally clear form of the question of no first use of nuclear weapons has made it possible to make the problem of preventing nuclear war the central topic of international dialogue. The harmony of the fundamental approaches of the Soviet Union, the other countries of the socialist community and also of the nonaligned states to the problem of preventing nuclear war was ascertained in the course of the discussion in the United Nations.

At the suggestion of the delegations of India and Mexico provisions were incorporated in the declaration on the prevention of nuclear catastrophe confirming that the goal recognized by all is the complete preclusion of the possibility of the use of nuclear weapons by means of a halt to their production with the subsequent liquidation of the stockpiles thereof; priority at the disarmament negotiations should be given nuclear disarmament; as a first step in this direction the use of nuclear weapons and nuclear war should be outlawed.

Considering the real complexity of the problem of the removal of the nuclear threat, the declaration points to the sole intelligent path of its solution--the path of negotiations and the abandonment of the spurring of military hysteria and ultimatums and "linkages" and the path of strict observance of the principle of equality and equal security.

An invariable distinguishing feature of Soviet foreign policy and diplomacy is unity of word and deed. Under the conditions where the shadow of nuclear war has been hanging over the world the Soviet Union is not only proposing specific ways to rescue mankind therefrom but also acting resolutely to ensure real movement along these paths. This was manifested as clearly as could be at the UN General Assembly Second Special Disarmament Session in the summer of 1982.

The appearance at the session of the Soviet Union was again a reminder that it is its policy which is from start to finish of a constructive nature and is creating real opportunities for the consolidation of peace. The military, including nuclear, might of the USSR, its economic and political power and its high international authority serve as a counterweight to NATO's potential for the preparation of war. The Soviet Union is using its might in the interests of preventing a nuclear catastrophe: it has solemnly undertaken not to be the first to use nuclear weapons.

The USSR's bold action was aimed at strengthening trust in relations between states precisely at a time when trust had been thoroughly undermined by attempts to disrupt the evolved balance of forces, achieve superiority over the Soviet Union and derail the positive results of

detente and who are calling for the start of a crusade against communism and essentially against all mankind.

It is significant that in parallel with the UN disarmament forum held in New York a top-level NATO Council session was gathering in Washington which confirmed the militarist policy of the United States and the bloc as a whole. The R. Reagan administration has begun to translate its purposes aimed at the preparation for war one after the other into the language of specific directives with respect to the organizational development and fitting out of the armed forces. Thus the Pentagon document "Directives for the Organizational Development of the United States' Armed Forces," according to which the United States should in all indicators be "No 1 power" militarily, has been made public. In the name of the achievement of superiority it is planned over the next 5 years to spend no less than \$1.5 trillion on U.S. military preparations. The main efforts are being concentrated on the development of strategic offensive forces. The military budget for 1983 envisages a more than 40-percent increase in allocations for them, as a result of which by the end of the 1980's the number of nuclear warheads per launch (flight) will have increased by a factor of 1.5. There will be a simultaneous increase in their accuracy and yield.

The American strategy of so-called "direct confrontation" permeating the "Directives" and the statements of representatives of the administration does not simply imbibe all the extremes of previous militarist goals but makes them even tougher. It is oriented primarily toward a nuclear first strike. Washington has supplemented the "limited war" doctrine with the concept of a "protracted nuclear war," from which it hopes to emerge the winner. The new strategy sanctions the most barbaric methods of warfare using not only nuclear but all other types of weapon of people's mass destruction (neutron, chemical and other weapons). Qualitatively new arms systems are being created in accordance with it: the MX intercontinental ballistic missiles, ballistic missiles on the Trident I and Trident II submarines, the B-1B and Stealth bombers, long-range cruise missiles, binary chemical ammunition, beam-type weapons and others. In the event of their deployment, the new arms systems would be truly destabilizing, increasing the danger of the outbreak of war. "The improvement of the United States' nuclear forces which is under way," American Prof L. Beres concludes on the basis of a study of the military programs and the statements of the head of the Pentagon, "has been brought about by the directive concerning the need to gain the upper hand in a protracted nuclear war with the USSR."*

Under the international-political conditions which have been created the Soviet Union's new initiative struck home, as they say. Even before it was announced, a number of countries had appealed in the course of the work of the second special session to the nuclear states to undertake no first use of nuclear weapons, freeze nuclear arsenals and embark immediately on nuclear disarmament negotiations.

* L.R. Beres, "Myths and Realities: U.S. Nuclear Strategy," Muscatine (Iowa), December 1982, p 10.

And when the Soviet Union's undertaking not to be the first to use nuclear weapons was read out from the session's platform, there was an explosion of applause. Its participants fittingly evaluated the consistency and love of peace of Soviet foreign policy and the perseverance with which the Soviet state is striving for peace.

As many delegates observed, the significance of this act of good will amounts primarily to the fact that it corresponds to the vital interests of all peoples and all mankind. The Soviet initiative was welcomed by the socialist countries and Asian, African and Latin American states. And certain representatives of the capitalist West also were unable to deny its major significance.

The will of the overwhelming majority of states was expressed with all certainty at the UN General Assembly 37th Session in a special resolution which emphasizes the importance of the USSR's unilateral step and contains an appeal to the other nuclear powers to also proclaim their renunciation of the first use of nuclear weapons, which would be of great significance for preventing a nuclear war. Thus the idea of the nonuse of nuclear weapons and the Soviet Union's efforts with respect to its solution will be supported henceforward by the entire authority of the United Nations.

The Soviet Union's adoption of a unilateral commitment on no first use of nuclear weapons confirmed again the utter groundlessness of the myth of the "Soviet military threat" and showed graphically that the USSR threatens no state on no continent and, in addition, believes in the power of commonsense and the possibility of mankind doing everything to avoid nuclear conflict.

Currently only the United States and its closest NATO allies oppose no first use of nuclear weapons since the gamble on such use constitutes the very essence of their military strategy.

To justify the West's negative position use is frequently made of crude fabrications like the assertions that the Soviet Union considers victory in a nuclear war possible. In this connection PRAVDA published on 21 October 1981 a special statement confirming and concretizing the corresponding appraisal made by the 26th CPSU Congress: "Only those who have resolved to commit suicide could start a nuclear war in the hope of emerging from it victorious. Whatever might the attacker may possess and whatever method of unleashing nuclear war he might choose, he would not achieve his goals. Retribution would inexorably follow."

The speeches of NATO representatives in the United Nations put forward the idea, which is puzzling at least, that the USSR's proposal is virtually contrary to the UN Charter inasmuch as it, they say, ties the hands of the victim of aggression--robs him of the possibility of resorting to nuclear weapons as a "means of self-defense". This is malicious juggling for the fact that the Soviet proposal is aimed precisely at saving future generations from the disasters of war, that is, at the accomplishment of the mission with which the text of the UN Charter begins, is manifestly ignored here. The assertions concerning the "right" to first use of nuclear weapons "in self-defense" cannot fail to be perceived as a trick for the purpose of evading

responsibility for the unleashing of a nuclear war and continuing the policy of nuclear blackmail.

As is known, the NATO Council drew up the participants' "solemn collective undertaking" that none of their arms would be used "other than in the course of a retaliatory strike" and are attempting to counterpose this to the Soviet commitment on no first use of nuclear weapons. The experience of history testifies to the value of such declarations. It is well known that not one, even the most arrant, aggressor has launched an attack without passing it off as a "retaliatory strike". To recall just the start of World War II. In addition, the military-strategic doctrine of the present Washington administration provides for the delivery of a "disarming nuclear strike," which the United States could inflict first on the other side on the pretext that it would be intended to prevent any hypothetical attack on the United States. Consequently, the "disarming nuclear strike" is also, according to NATO concepts, a "retaliatory strike". In other words, this formula in no way hinders aggression on the part of NATO with any type of weapon.

The attempt to speculate on the fact that the proposition concerning no first use of nuclear weapons is allegedly contrary to the UN Charter expresses an endeavor to fundamentally distort the essence and goals of the United Nations for it is aimed at portraying the entire disarmament process as pointless from the Charter's viewpoint. In fact some people may regard bacteriological weapons as the best means of self-defense. What, then, in this case--rescind the agreement reached in this connection in full accordance with the UN Charter? Or, perhaps, renounce the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty? After all, according to this logic, it also is "contrary" to the Charter inasmuch as it deprives countries of the world community of the possibility of acquiring nuclear weapons for "self-defense purposes". And the nonnuclear states could conclude that the best means of self-defense for them are nuclear weapons.

The demagogic nature of Western assertions throws light sufficiently on the negative attitude of the United States and its allies to the USSR's proposal, approved by the United Nations back in 1976, for the conclusion of a world treaty on the nonuse of force in international relations or, in other words, implementation of the above-mentioned fundamental principle of the UN Charter and making it a permanent law of international relations.

NATO representatives declare that the West cannot assume the commitment on no first use of nuclear weapons inasmuch as the Warsaw Pact allegedly has superiority in conventional arms. The facts and figures testify primarily to the utter groundlessness of such an assertion. Besides, the USSR advocates the limitation of conventional arms also and a search for reasonable mutually acceptable solutions on these issues also. In 1976, a year after the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, the USSR proposed in conjunction with the other Warsaw Pact states to all who signed the Final Act the signing of a treaty on no first use of nuclear weapons against one another. It was turned down by the West on the pretext that the socialist countries are superior in conventional arms. In March 1979 the Soviet Union proposed to

the same countries an arrangement concerning no first use of both nuclear and conventional arms and the conclusion of a kind of nonaggression pact. However, this initiative also failed to find a positive response among those to whom it was addressed.

Under the conditions of the present exacerbation of the international situation particular importance is attached to the proposal put forward in the Political Declaration of the Prague meeting of Warsaw Pact states (January 1983) for the conclusion of a treaty on the mutual nonuse of military force and the maintenance of relations of peace between the states of the Warsaw Pact and NATO. Its essence is the renunciation of first use against one another of both nuclear and conventional weapons. It is a question of a peace initiative of exceptional significance. Representatives of the antiwar movement and all peace-loving public forces in the NATO countries are demanding increasingly insistently of their governments a serious and objective approach to it.

The conclusion of the treaty would be an act contributing ultimately to the surmounting of the division of Europe into military-political groupings. An important singularity of it is the fact that it envisages not only commitments in international law on the nonuse of military force but also a whole number of other, very material commitments in the interests of the consolidation of peace and the strengthening of trust and mutual understanding. The fact, for example, that the treaty proposes the inclusion of the parties' commitment to conduct negotiations in a spirit of good will on effective measures for a halt to the arms race, arms limitation and disarmament would emphasize the organic connection between the moral-political aspects of security and practical steps in the disarmament sphere. Essentially a qualitatively new, immeasurably more propitious atmosphere for halting the present dangerous development of events, lending additional impetus to continuation of the detente process and on this path tackling one after the other the tasks of limiting and reducing arsenals of weapons, primarily nuclear, would be created in the event of conclusion of the treaty.

Particular mention should be made of the utter groundlessness of the attempts to dispute the tremendous significance of the undertaking on no first use of nuclear weapons for the adoption of effective measures to curb the nuclear threat. Primarily such a decision inevitably entails the corresponding adjustments to military organizational development and planning. As USSR Defense Minister D.F. Ustinov explained, the Soviet Union's undertaking on no first use of nuclear weapons is of an entirely concrete nature. It means that "in the training of the armed forces even more attention will now be paid to the tasks of preventing the growth of a military conflict into a nuclear conflict, and these tasks in all their multifariousness are becoming an immutable part of our military activity."* A stricter framework is thereby created in the training of troops and staff, determination of the arms composition and the organization of even stricter control ensuring the preclusion of an unauthorized launch of nuclear weapons from tactical through strategic. Thus the USSR's decision on no first use of nuclear weapons is a really tangible practical act as a result of whose implementation the entire complex of questions connected with the easing and elimination of the nuclear threat appears in a new light.

* AVDA 12 July 1982.

Recognition of the inadmissibility of first use of nuclear weapons is an important point of departure of the strengthening of international stability and an integral program of measures whose ultimate task is preclusion of the very possibility of nuclear catastrophe. It is a question here of measures which are perfectly feasible in practice if adequate political will is displayed on the part of the other nuclear powers.

Renunciation of first use of nuclear weapons would create new prerequisites for banning nuclear weapons and embarking, finally, on the accomplishment of the tasks of nuclear disarmament. At the UN General Assembly Second Special Disarmament Session the Soviet Union proposed a nuclear disarmament program which would be implemented in stages. One of its first stages could be a halt to the production of fissionable material for the creation of nuclear weapons and a renunciation of the creation of new types thereof. The Soviet Union's support for the idea of a mutual freeze of nuclear arsenals as a first step on the way to a reduction therein and ultimately to their total liquidation should be viewed in the same context.

The adoption by all the nuclear states of a commitment on no first use of nuclear weapons would be of inestimable significance for solution of the question of strengthening the security of the nonnuclear states. The Soviet declaration on the unilateral granting of security guarantees to the nonnuclear countries which do not have nuclear weapons on their territory, that is, on the nonuse against them of nuclear weapons generally, holds good in full here, of course.*

Authoritative voices, including those from the ranks of the ruling class, are being heard increasingly loudly in the West calling for adjustments to be made to the policy of Washington and NATO with regard for realities. In the opinion of many influential figures, scientists and diplomats, the very foundations of this flawed policy, which were laid back when the United States was superior in nuclear arms, which has long since ceased to be the case and which position cannot be restored, have revealed their groundlessness. And as a step toward realism certain of the West's politicians are proposing renunciation of first use of nuclear weapons.

The USSR's historic act on no first use of nuclear weapons has put on the agenda of international life a question an answer to which no one will succeed in evading. Ultimately it is precisely the position on this question which reveals the truth and shows who is gambling on the unleashing of a thermonuclear war and who is fighting to prevent it.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1983.

8850

CSO: 1816/10

* Back at the UN General Assembly First Special Disarmament Session in 1978 the USSR declared that it would never use nuclear weapons against states which renounce the production and acquisition of nuclear weapons and do not have them on their territory. At the same time the Soviet Union expressed a readiness to conclude agreements in this connection with any nonnuclear state and called on the other nuclear powers to act in the same way and assume analogous commitments. The United States, Britain and France also made declarations concerning the nonuse of nuclear weapons against nonnuclear countries, but made various reservations considerably devaluing such declarations.

INTERNAL CHANGES IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES REQUIRED FOR ECONOMIC PROGRESS

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 5,
May 83 pp 70-83

[Article by I. Yegorov: "The Developing Countries' Struggle for Economic Independence"]

[Excerpt]

I

Problems of economic independence are directly connected with the nature of the participation of this country or the other in the international division of labor. In turn, this participation is determined by a set of internal and external factors. A fundamentally profoundly contradictory system of the international division of labor evolved in the era of colonialism which condemned the colonial and dependent countries to a position of passive and exploited participants in the reproduction process in the developed capitalist states. The forcible enlistment of these states in the world capitalist economy led to the deformation and segmentation of their internal economic system. The possibilities of an extension of the social division of labor nationally thus proved to be partially closed off, and the economy of the colonies and semicolonies increasingly lost inner integrity as it was pulled into world economic relations.

Although not doing away with their subordinate position in the world capitalist economy, the colonial and dependent countries' achievement of political independence did nonetheless initiate profound qualitative changes in the world's political and economic structure. A considerable span of time was needed, obviously, for these processes to gather strength and come to be tangibly reflected in international relations. It was only on the eve and at the outset of the 1970's perhaps that a sufficiently high level of political consolidation of the group of developing countries was achieved, which enabled them to step up the confrontation with the imperialist states in the world arena.

As far as the economic sphere is concerned, the first result of political liberation was the appearance of a multitude of national economies which had emerged as a consequence of the collapse of the previous structural relations of the "metropolis-colony" type in the world capitalist economy. Within the framework of this economy there began to develop intensively such processes

as 1) the trend toward consolidation of the emerged national economies, thanks to the consistent consolidation of the developing countries' state sovereignty and their control over the sphere of the economy, including the sphere of foreign economic relations, included; and 2) the growing expansion of the transnational corporations, whose activity became under the new conditions the basic means of linking the developing countries to the centers of imperialism and their integration in the world capitalist economy and a strengthening of the indirect levers of exploitation and dependence.

At the same time participation in the international capitalist division of labor remains for the young states economically inevitable even after national liberation. For this reason, even while opposed to the old system of relations, they are forced to conduct the bulk of their foreign economic transactions within their framework. This contradictoriness is a feature characteristic of the developing countries' special place in the world capitalist economy. The continuing dependence on the centers of imperialism on the other hand means that practically all measures to strengthen the young national economy acquire an international dimension. The implementation of internal transformations under these conditions affects in one way or another the interests of international monopoly capital and encounters its bitter resistance. Here, as Soviet scholars have observed, "the struggle for the retention and consolidation of imperialism's positions in the emerging countries is being waged not only and not so much even by private monopolies as by states and alliances of imperialist states even."²

Under the conditions of confrontation with the imperialist powers and the international monopolies the activity of the emerging states aimed at surmounting economic backwardness is objectively linked with the struggle for economic independence. In other words, in the current period the struggle for economic independence is becoming an integral part of the process of economic development on the periphery of the world capitalist economy and is an essential condition of their conversion into active participants in the international division of labor. In addition, this struggle under the conditions of the economic ascendancy of the developed capitalist countries and the high mobility of international capital is inevitably assuming the nature of the emerging states' collective counteraction to imperialism. Given the evolved correlation of forces in the world capitalist economy, the developing countries are forced to jointly defend the mere possibility of the realization of rights ensuing from their exercise of their acquired national sovereignty.

At the same time, as at the stage of the struggle for political liberation also, the decisive international factor ensuring the necessary conditions for the young states' advancement in the direction of economic independence is world socialism.

The consolidation of the political and economic positions of the socialist community countries in the international arena, their consistent policy aimed at a strengthening of peace and the relaxation of tension and the development of economic cooperation with the emerging states based on equality and mutual benefit--all this is enabling the latter to oppose imperialist diktat,

consolidate political independence and pose and tackle successfully tasks of economic decolonization. "Were it not for the Soviet Union," F. Castro observed in February 1976, "it would be impossible to imagine even either the degree of independence which small states enjoy today or the peoples' successful struggle for the return of natural resources to their control."

The mere fact that in limiting imperialism's aggressive encroachments the socialist countries are acting assertively in defense of the young states' political independence is enabling them to concentrate efforts on tackling economic tasks, including the achievement of economic independence. "Solidarity with states liberated from colonial oppression and with the peoples defending their independence," Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, emphasized, "was and remains a fundamental principle of Soviet foreign policy."

Practically all the acts of the young states aimed at the strengthening and development of their economy thus appear as different manifestations of the struggle for economic independence. These are purely internal measures, transformations in the developing countries, their bilateral relations with imperialist powers and the emerging states' collective actions in the international arena supported by the socialist countries.

Let us first of all look at internal aspects of the struggle for economic independence.

II

The discussion of recent years concerning a new international economic order NIEO has to some extent obscured the important fact that decisive significance for the developing countries' economic and social advancement since the time of their achievement of state independence has been attached ultimately to internal factors and progressive socioeconomic transformations. As Marxist experts have shown convincingly, the implementation of such transformations creates the necessary prerequisites for the solution of urgent problems of the emerging states and constitutes the nucleus of "development policy". It is in these that the creative potentialities of the peoples of the young states as, in V.I. Lenin's expression, the "creators of a new life" and subjects of world history are displayed.

Following the completion of political decolonization, the developing countries achieved considerable successes tackling the tasks of strengthening the economic base of state independence and ensuring national sovereignty over their natural resources, the creation of national forms of organization of the economy and foreign trade and limitation of the sphere of neocolonial exploitation. This enabled them to accelerate appreciably the rate of economic growth, begin an in-depth reorganization of the national economic structure inherited from the past, enhance their role in the system of world economic relations and, finally, pose the question of the establishment of a NIEO.

A most important role in the strengthening of the emerging states' economic independence was performed by the nationalization of foreign property, which struck most heavily at colonial-type world economic structures. And although

it affected only part of the foreign companies' property,³ its implementation created the conditions for expansion of the national base of accumulation, the accelerated structural reorganization of the economy of the young states and a strengthening of their positions in the world economy. According to the data of UN experts, in the period 1960-1976 some 1,369 actions were undertaken in 71 developing countries with respect to establishing national control in the spheres of finances, the infrastructure, extractive industry, plantations and certain sectors of processing industry.⁴

The most indicative are the results of nationalization in the oil and mining industry: it contributed to the establishment of state control over the development of the developing countries' most valuable minerals, modified appreciably the former system of provision of the centers of capitalism with energy and raw material resources and, finally, lent impetus to the more comprehensive development of national industry. At the same time, however, from the viewpoint of internal economic processes no less significance was attached to the nationalization of foreign banks and insurance companies, transport and communications enterprises and key processing industry facilities.

The defenders of neocolonialism are trying to discredit in every possible way both the idea of nationalization and, primarily, its salutary influence on the course of the emerging countries' economic development. Silence is maintained here about the fact that the efficient operation of nationalized facilities depends not only on internal factors but also on the extent of foreign control on international shipments, processing and the sale of commodities on foreign markets and on supplies to the developing countries of modern equipment and technology. As far as the Western states and the transnational corporations (TNC) themselves are concerned, they respond to acts of nationalization with direct economic reprisals: a boycott of the nationalized enterprises, attempts at sabotage, the recall of skilled specialists and financial and other sanctions, not to mention well-known instances of subversive activity against the national governments.⁵

Naturally, the significance of nationalization is far from being confined merely to immediate economic consequences--the increase in the number of nationalized enterprises or their increased share of social production. No less material are the indirect results of the nationalization of foreign property. In particular, it is this which initiates the process of the reorganization of relations with the TNC and thereby with the developed capitalist countries as a whole. It is not fortuitous, for example, that the proportion of direct investments in the overall influx of foreign capital (state and private loans, direct and portfolio investments) declined from 14.1 percent to 10.5 percent in the period 1970 through 1980. In the same period the relative significance of profits from direct capital investments in the total outflow of capital fell from 43.8 percent to 21.5 percent, but the proportion of the amounts in payment of interest on loan capital and portfolio investment dividends increased from 21.1 percent in 1970 to 39.8 percent in 1980. Altogether in the period 1970-1980 total direct foreign investment (including reinvestments) in the developing countries constituted \$62.6 billion, but revenue from the direct investments constituted \$139.7 billion, that is, 2.2 times more.⁶

Together with nationalization the developing states also employ other methods of limiting the activity of the TNC on their territory: repurchase, partial nationalization, selective admission to certain sectors and spheres of the economy, deinvestment, establishment of a ceiling on the transfer of profits and an obligatory level of reinvestment, imposition of obligations on foreign companies with respect to "integration" with local facilities, an increase in the level of taxation and currency-finance control.

Under pressure of the national state foreign capital is increasingly often forced to agree to cooperation with local entrepreneurs and the public sector with junior partner status. According to UN data, in the period 1971-1975 some 180 American corporations owned a lesser proportion of stock in 28 percent of their foreign affiliates compared with 11 percent in 1950, 135 companies of West European countries (42 percent and 10 percent) and 76 other TNC (74 percent and 16 percent respectively).⁷

At the same time, as the adduced data testify, the Western monopolies continue to hold on to quite strong positions in the economy of the developing countries. Dominant in the sphere of technology and product sales, they are often in full control of enterprise activity also, even when agreeing to joint ownership with local capital or the state. In addition, as the UN analytical survey "Towards the New International Economic Order" observes, "frequently control connected with national participation in ownership have proved to be purely symbolic... while the state's participation in share capital has in a number of cases secured financial benefits for the TNC without undermining their influence on the control of production."⁸

The trend toward the consolidation of economic independence and the ouster of foreign entrepreneurial capital is paving a way for itself via numerous transitional forms of relations taking shape between the developing states and the international monopolies. In the final analysis it is leading to the creation of a qualitatively new world economic situation, within whose framework foreign capital is losing the chance of direct exploitation of the emerging countries and resorting increasingly extensively to indirect methods of exploitation, which is secured by the entire system of relations of present-day capitalism. Whence it follows that an important task of the young states is the struggle for elimination of the unequal economic relations in the world capitalist economy as a whole.

Historically the struggle for a reorganization of international economic relations on just, democratic principles goes back to October, and the modern slogans of a NIEO have an obvious continuity with the goals for which the world's first socialist state struggled from the very outset. Thus the principles of the equality of the sides, mutual benefit, respect for national sovereignty and noninterference in internal affairs were recorded in its first decrees and international agreements.

The USSR's consistent struggle for the implementation of Lenin's principles of equal economic intercourse between states with different social systems, as, equally, its specific contractual practice, have had a tremendous impact on the development of the entire system of world economic relations. They serve as an example to many emerging countries and their associations in the carrying out of tasks for strengthening the foundations of economic independence.

III

The consolidation of the economic independence of the developing countries has also been reflected to a certain extent in the dynamics of the most important economic indicators: their share of world production and trade, the growth rate of CNP, industrial production and labor productivity and the change in the commodity structure of exports. A change in a number of trends in favor of this group of states within the framework of the world capitalist economy was discerned in the 1970's.

Thus in the time of independent development there has been an appreciable increase in the overall economic growth rate in Asian, African and Latin American countries, exceeding the corresponding indicator of the preceding, colonial, period by a factor of more than 2.5. Whereas in the period 1913-1950 the average annual increase in the gross domestic product constituted 2.1 percent, in the 1960's it was the equivalent of 5.6 percent and in the 1970's approximately 6 percent. In the past decade they also surpassed the Western states for the first time in production growth rate per capita (3.7 percent and 5 percent respectively),⁹ which made it possible to halt the long-term trend of an increase in the gap in development levels between the center and the periphery of the world capitalist economy. Having reached the maximum in 1970 (13:1), the gap between them in production levels per capita had declined to 11.3:1 by the start of the 1980's.¹⁰

There have also been pronounced changes in the developing countries' foreign trade. The chronic decline in their relative significance in world trade was replaced in the 1970's by a rising trend connected with the sharp increase in fuel costs on the one hand and the acceleration of industrialization on the other (see Table 1).

Simultaneously with the increased relative significance of the developing states in international trade there has been a marked increase in their share of reciprocal supplies (from 20.2 percent in 1970 to 27.3 percent of total exports in 1980) with somewhat of a reduction in the role of the markets of Western countries, to which in 1981 some 67 percent of the developing countries' exports were sent compared with 72.4 percent in 1970. The significance for the developing countries of their reciprocal exchange in the marketing of industrial products is particularly great: in 1980 it accounted for 50 percent of chemical product, 46 percent of machinery and equipment and 31 percent of other finished product exports.¹¹

Table 1. Relative Significance of the Developing Countries in World Exports of Individual Commodity Groups (%)

	<u>1970</u>	<u>1975</u>	<u>1980</u>
Food	32	28.5	28.3
Raw material	30.5	28.5	28.8
Fuel	63.5	73.8	72.3
Industrial products	6.5	7	9.8
As a whole	17.6	24	28

Estimated from BULLETIN MENSUEL DE STATISTIQUE May 1982, special Table C.

The above-mentioned factors--the increase in fuel costs and the process of industrialization--brought about appreciable changes in the 1970's in the export structure of the developing countries at a time of the relative stability of their import structure.

Table 2. Commodity Structure of the Developing Countries' Trade (% of total)

	<u>1970</u>		<u>1975</u>		<u>1979</u>	
	<u>Exports</u>	<u>Imports</u>	<u>Exports</u>	<u>Imports</u>	<u>Exports</u>	<u>Imports</u>
Food	27	14	16	13	14	12
Raw Material	24	13	10	12	10	11
Fuel	33	8	60	15	57	16
Industrial products	16	65	14	60	19	61

Source: "Manuel de statistiques du commerce international et du developpement. Supplement 1981," pp 88-90.

Thus in the 10 years the relative significance of food and raw material commodities in the developing countries' exports declined by more than half at the same time as a sharp increase in the proportion of fuel from one-third to three-fifths thanks to the fact that prices for fuel increased approximately 4 times faster than for the remaining products. Given the previous price proportions, the export structure, according to our calculations, would be thus at the end of the following decade: food 21 percent, raw material 18 percent, fuel 25 percent and industrial products 36 percent.

The adduced calculations testify that it was precisely the exports of industrial products--in physical terms--which developed most rapidly in the 1970's and essentially determined the main structural shifts in the developing countries' foreign trade. This is the result of the development of processing industry, whose production increased by a factor of approximately 1.9 in the 10 years. And inasmuch as exports of industrial products grew more rapidly than the production volume by the start of the 1980's the developing countries' share of world exports of finished products and intermediate products approximated their share of world processing industry production (see Table 3).

As a whole, the adduced data testify both to a consolidation of the developing countries' economic positions in the world economy and to positive structural changes in their economy in the 1970's. However, this overall picture conceals very varied results of the development of individual groups of emerging countries.

Table 3. Developing Countries' Relative Significance in World Production and Exports of Processing Industry Products (%)

	<u>1960</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1975</u>	<u>1980</u>
Production	8.2	8.8	10.3	10.9
Exports	3.9	5	6.3	9

Source: "World Industry in 1980," UNIDO, New York, 1981, pp 29-36.

The exacerbation of the general crisis of capitalism, which was expressed in the two most profound and prolonged crisis depressions since the war (1974-1975 and 1980-1982), sharply increased the unevenness of the development of the countries of the periphery and increased their economies' dependence on the conditions of reproduction in the centers of capitalism. Whence the increasingly great polarization of the emerging states in terms of economic growth rate and income level, the further enlistment of some of these states in the system of international capitalist exploitation, sharp fluctuations in foreign economic development conditions and the growing instability of the entire system of capitalism's world economic relations.

Thus by the end of the past decade the gap between individual developing countries in terms of the production of gross domestic product per capita had grown considerably, and its maximum value had risen to 170-200 in 1979 compared with 70-80 in 1970.¹² In the least developed states and countries with a low income level (two-thirds of the population of the developing world) the average annual rate of increase of gross domestic product per capita constituted only 1.1 percent in 1970-1979 compared with 3.8-3.9 percent in the "new industrial states" and the OPEC countries (one fifth of the population respectively). As a result the aggregate gross domestic product of the last two groups in 1979 exceeded the analogous indicator of the first two by a factor of 2.9, and the level of average per capita production in the first group was 16 times lower than in the OPEC countries.¹³

IV

Simultaneously with the differentiation of the developing countries they were further pulled, primarily the "new industrial states" and the OPEC countries, into the international capitalist division of labor. In respect of the first group of countries and territories basic significance was attached to such forms and methods as the opening of their products' access to the markets of the West, the extensive expansion of the TNC, the transfer to these countries and territories of modern technology and, particularly, the sharp increase in their financial dependence on the centers of capitalism. As far as the wealthiest OPEC members are concerned, here the West has put its main emphasis on the conquest of their domestic market (including supplies of modern equipment and arms) and the creation of a petrodollar recycling mechanism.

The developing countries' growing financial indebtedness has in recent years also become a principal method of attaching the young states to the world capitalist system. In the period 1971-1982 the developing countries' total indebtedness increased from \$90 billion to \$626 billion. In this same period annual debt-servicing payments increased from \$10.9 billion to \$131.3 billion, including an increase from \$10.1 billion to \$121.9 billion to the Development Assistance Committee countries, international organizations and private banks.¹⁴ It should be noted that the total debt of the developing countries which are not OPEC members has become comparable in its proportions (\$430 billion in 1981) to the amount of net overseas assets of the OPEC members held in the capitalist centers (\$423 billion).¹⁵ In other words, acting as the main intermediary in the recycling of petrodollars, the West's finance system is making increasingly extensive use of the possibilities of some developing countries for the enslavement and exploitation of others.

The sharp rise in the financial indebtedness of the group of developing states is a distinguishing singularity of the evolution of the world capitalist economy in the 1970's. Its consequences go far beyond the purely economic framework inasmuch as the imperialist centers are availing themselves of it to achieve a broad range of political and strategic goals. These include direct influence on the domestic and foreign economic policy of individual states, the creation of a more propitious investment climate for the international monopolies, the undermining of the unity of the developing countries in their opposition to the imperialist powers and the accomplishment of directly political tasks, including attempts to split the alliance of world socialism and the national liberation movement.

In respect of many young states the financial indebtedness performs the same function as imperialist "assistance" with reference to the developing world as a whole. (Dzh.P. L'yuis), chairman of the Development Assistance Committee, once spoke candidly of the multiplicity of tasks of this "assistance": "Economic assistance, like military assistance, may serve to strengthen the potential of all Third World countries and indirectly assist the creation of forward bases of the donor-country... it could also improve access to strategic types of raw material. In addition, assistance may also be dictated partially by direct political and ideological tasks." More, as (Dzh. L'yuis) admits, in recent years the imperialist powers have attached increasingly great significance precisely to tasks of a military-political nature.¹⁶

At the same time, if "assistance" may be categorized as a kind of inevitable overhead necessary for ensuring the continuous functioning of the world capitalist economy, financial indebtedness is also a form of direct economic exploitation. The capitalist centers also obtain a number of additional benefits here, furthermore. First, the developing countries' exports are tied more closely to Western markets. Apart from this, pressure is exerted on the export structure and prices of export commodities from the developing states (in a downward direction) merely by virtue of the specifics of the world capitalist market. Finally, the dominating position of the West's financial institutions, on whose decisions not only the debtor-countries but also the creditor-countries depend, is strengthened. As a result, if it is considered that the sum total of debts and sum total of foreign assets of the developing countries are approximately identical, it transpires that all these huge benefits cost international monopoly capital practically nothing.

The developing countries' position deteriorated markedly under the impact of the latest economic crisis of 1980-1982 which embraced the world capitalist economy. It entailed a decline in the growth rate and in a number of instances a decline in the industrial production of the emerging states. In 1980 the volume thereof diminished 1 percent compared with the previous year, mainly as a result of the considerable drop in oil production (minus 8.2 percent) and the stagnation in processing industry in Asian countries (an increase of 0.5 percent). A decline in the production of the processing sectors of Latin America (minus 2.3 percent) was observed in 1981, and the total increase in industrial output in the developing world constituted little more than 1 percent. The average annual rate of growth of the

emerging states declined from 2.9 percent in 1980 to 0.6 percent in 1981. Here, as observed at the recent Seventh Conference of Heads of State and Government of Nonaligned Countries in Delhi, there was a decline in per capita production for the first time since the war in many developing countries.¹⁷

Taking advantage of the evolved international finance and trade mechanism, in this period the industrial countries of the West again attempted to partially alleviate their economic difficulties at the expense of the emerging states. Thus in 1981 the volume of the latter's exports to the developed capitalist countries declined almost 6 percent, while the reverse trade flow increased by 5.3 percent.¹⁸ The overall instability of the system of capitalism's international economic relations increased, and the inadequacy of its mechanisms for the requirements of the development of the emerging countries was revealed more distinctly. As a result of the effect of these mechanisms under the conditions of the crisis upheavals in the world capitalist economy in the past decade there was an increase in the developing countries' dependence on the centers of capitalism in the most varied spheres.

At the same time, however, official representatives of the West are attempting to embellish the state of affairs in the sphere of the mutual relations of the centers of capitalism with the emerging states and are speaking of the "serious nature and large scale" of the developed capitalist countries' efforts in rendering the developing world "assistance" and granting it a variety of "privileges," referring at the same time to their own economic difficulties as an obstacle to the realization of individual demands thereof. At the same time it is even frequently admitted in the West that the progress in the achievement of a NIEO is very negligible. Thus the above-mentioned (Dzh. L'yuis) notes in his survey for 1981: "1980 was a year of many disappointments for the cause of cooperation for development. In some respects 1981 was even worse."¹⁹

V

Questions of the reorganization of world economic relations have been illustrated extensively in Soviet literature.²⁰ For this reason we will dwell only on certain results of the past decade.

The hopes which emerged in the mid-1970's for the relatively rapid introduction in the practice of international economic intercourse of more democratic and just standards were replaced on the boundary of the two decades by disenchantment. At all the most important international forums of recent years the representatives of the emerging states have unequivocally evaluated the results of the reorganization of world economic relations as manifestly inadequate and negative even. "The economic problems being encountered by the developing countries," the Sixth Nonaligned Conference in Havana, for example, observed, "have become even more serious... and the negotiations on a restructuring of economic relations are deadlocked."²¹ This evaluation was essentially confirmed at the Seventh Nonaligned Conference.

At the same time we cannot fail to see also the positive features which have been manifested in the course of the struggle for a reorganization of

international economic relations. In particular, the more profound understanding of development problems both globally and nationally, recognition of the basic factors impeding reorganization and the more precise delineation of the confrontational forces--all this may be put down on the credit side of the 1970's. Therefore in providing a most generalized description of the past decade it is evidently necessary to call it a period of intensive quest for new approaches to the solution of a number of global problems, including questions of the development of international economic intercourse.

The negative results in realization of the NIEO program are connected primarily with the sharp deterioration in the political climate in the world on the eve and at the outset of the 1980's and the attempts of the imperialist powers, primarily the United States, to turn back the positive processes of the past two decades and to resurrect in full the imperial policy of diktat in international affairs and power pressure on the socialist countries and the emerging states pursuing an independent foreign policy course.

As has repeatedly been the case previously, imperialism is throwing into the balance its entire political and material might to preserve the foundations of the system of exploitation of the peoples which it created. The merger of the political (including military) strength of the imperialist powers and the financial might of international monopoly capital is occurring today on a new--world--level and on an unprecedented scale. This process acquired a qualitatively new nature in the 1970's, when "collective" forms of neocolonialism took shape, and American imperialism, making active use of the sum total of economic, political and military means, attempted upon the arrival in the White House of the R. Reagan administration to switch to a global counteroffensive against the forces of peace and progress.

The tasks which Washington is setting itself are perfectly obvious: first, to weaken world socialism and its growing influence on the course of international events; second, to curb the accelerating erosion of the political and economic system of world capitalism (including the dominating positions of U.S. imperialism in this system) and bring under its strict control the development of events both on the periphery and in the centers of world capitalism. Whence the avowed policy of the White House of frustrating detente, the sharp upward spiraling of international tension and the pumping up of armed conflicts in various parts of the world--Asia, Africa and Latin America. The Reagan administration is making active use here of anticommunism and anti-Sovietism to conceal the United States' imperial policy.

Essentially the same policy of spurring tension and instability is being pursued by the United States in the sphere of international economic relations: the use of economic boycott, embargoes and sanctions, the "freezing" of foreign holdings in American banks, the adoption of repressive measures, related to a law, against national states whose actions with respect to regulation of the national economy affect the interests of American monopolies, the unilateral raising of bank discount rates and so forth. The list of "acts" of Washington's in all spheres of international life is so long as to leave no doubt as to the general thrust of its foreign policy course.

If we examine the world economic aspects of U.S. policy in recent years, particularly at the start of the 1980's, the following picture emerges. The majority of the U.S. Administration's decisions and measures in this sphere are acts which are unilateral in form, avowedly hegemonist in nature and purely egotistical in content, that is, are steps directly contrary to the letter and spirit of fundamental UN documents on questions of the reorganization of world economic relations, particularly the Declaration on the Establishment of a NIEO and the Charter of States' Economic Rights and Duties. It is for this reason far from fortuitous that the heads of state and government of the nonaligned countries at the Delhi conference emphatically condemned "all forms of economic aggression, including the use of commercial sanctions or threats and other forms of blockade or measures of compulsion and blackmail employed by the developed countries against nonaligned and other developing countries as means of political pressure aimed at influencing or interfering in their sovereign decisions."

From the time that the program of a NIEO was put forward the United States has occupied in respect thereof the toughest position among the developed capitalist countries. This was manifested, inter alia, in the vote against the Charter of States' Economic Rights and Duties at the UN General Assembly 30th Session (1975) and in the attempts to impose its own scenario on the holding of global negotiations on key issues of the reorganization of international economic relations.

The United States acted similarly in respect of the draft Law of the Sea Convention, whose elaboration had taken almost 15 years, having rejected the compromise arrangements which had been arrived at.²² Naturally, each country has a right to defend its interests and put this proposal or the other to the international community. However, in this case it is a question of something different: Washington's systematic attempts to frustrate by every means the achievement of constructive solutions with respect to the reorganization of international economic relations.

The most reactionary forces of imperialism are thus making desperate efforts to undermine the first principle and initial foundation of the movement for a reorganization of international economic relations--the detente process, the strengthening of mutual trust between states and peoples and the extensive introduction in international life of the principles of peaceful coexistence and mutually profitable cooperation. The logic of their actions is simple and candid to the point of banality. Insofar as the reorganization of economic relations between states is primarily a political process, consequently, in order to frustrate or delay it it is necessary to jack up international tension to the maximum and complicate the general political atmosphere in the world.

What are the most general conclusions to be drawn from the experience of the struggle for a NIEO?

An analysis of the actual shifts in the world capitalist economy shows that they were primarily the result of the developing countries' own, internal efforts. At the same time the NIEO program pays unjustifiably little attention to this question. There is thus a gap between the actual development process and the collection of the Group of 77's foreign economic demands. In addition, with regard for the latest trends in the system of capitalism's world economic

relations it may be concluded that in its present form this program basically "overshoots" the main goal of the young states--economic decolonization and the consolidation of economic independence. The point being that the economic crises of recent years and the increased instability of all spheres of the world capitalist economy have revealed the vulnerability of the economy of the developing countries, intensified the unevenness of their development and at the same time led to an intensification and "diversification" of their dependence. At the same time, however, a number of provisions of the program, particularly expanded access to the West's commodity and financial markets and increased "assistance" and the influx of foreign capital, provides essentially for a further intensification of the dependence of the periphery on the centers of world capitalism.²³

It is not fortuitous that the question of the inadequacy under current conditions of Western models for the emerging states' development needs is being raised increasingly extensively in the developing world. At the same time the underlying logic of the platform of the NIEO continues to orient them predominantly toward the market models of interstate economic intercourse, proposing, it is true, to introduce to them elements of regulation in favor of the countries of the periphery. Yet under the conditions of the crisis upheavals and the consolidation of "collective" forms of neocolonialism the proposed elements of regulation of interstate relations "are not working" or, more precisely, are considerably inferior in efficiency to the measures of the developed capitalist states. As a result in center-periphery relations new elements of dependence are emerging or the former elements are being strengthened: along technology transfer, sources of financing and debt payments, the marketing of industrial commodities, TNC operations and so forth lines.

At the same time there exist in world economic practice forms of countries' economic interaction which are determined primarily by the needs and interests of individual independent states and not by the requirements and conditions of the movement of industrial, commercial and loan capital on an international scale. Such forms of long-term and stable cooperation based on international agreements and the broad consideration of mutual interests have long been employed by the socialist states. However, the NIEO program pays them unjustifiably little attention, which reduces its efficacy as a whole.

The program should, obviously, reflect more fully and specify the tasks of consolidation of the economic independence of the emerging states on the basis of the experience of the 1970's. It would be useful to reinterpret precisely from this angle the outlined goals and resources in their mutual linkage and with regard for the possible consequences for economic independence. The calls for a reassessment of the experience of OPEC, which earlier played a positive part in advancing the platform of the NIEO, merit attention, in particular. The negative consequences for the group of developing countries from the intensive integration of the wealthiest OPEC members in the world capitalist economy, which is not being accompanied by sufficient efforts to strengthen the independence of the young states and enhance their role in the solution of the most important world economic problems, are sufficiently obvious today.

The 1970's showed that the developed capitalist countries are ready to consent to this partial concession or the other, endeavoring at the same time to preserve the evolved system of relations between the center and the periphery of the world capitalist economy. This tactic has enabled them to impede the implementation of the progressive provisions of the NIEO. This fact also set off the insufficient maturity of the general prerequisites of a reorganization of international economic relations, which became obvious in connection with the complication of the international situation at the start of the 1980's.

All this demands, evidently, a shift of emphasis in the NIEO program to the realization primarily of universal general democratic principles and rules of international economic intercourse.²⁴ It is they which form the fundamental and long-term basis of a progressive reorganization of international economic relations, which cannot be a subject of "bargaining". This fact is of particular significance for, at a minimum, two reasons. The first is that the old--imperialist and colonialist--world order was based on the elimination of national sovereignties as its base element. Even now this element retains an important role in the system of neocolonialism, although the forms of its manifestation have become more flexible and disguised. The second reason is that by their very essence many specific provisions of the NIEO program cannot be anything other than a compromise between different states and groups of states. For this reason general democratic provisions and rules as the sole fundamental basis of possible compromises are so important.

In turn, in order to achieve real positive changes in the system of world economic relations it is essential first of all to strengthen and expand the general political base of concerted international actions and the atmosphere of trust and constructive cooperation between states. And the achievement of this goal demands, in turn, the utmost stimulation of the struggle for peace, detente and disarmament and the consolidation of all present-day anti-imperialist, progressive forces. "The easing of international tension and a halt to the arms race, which would free resources for development purposes," the Economic Declaration of the Seventh Nonaligned Conference observes, "are a vitally important requirement for the developing countries and an essential factor of world progress."

Thus the process of the reorganization of international economic relations viewed in the broad historical perspective appears initially the result of the purposeful actions of world socialism and subsequently, at the stage of economic decolonization, the result of the joint struggle of world socialism and the national liberation movement. This is why under current conditions the interaction of the socialist and developing states is a decisive factor determining the course of further struggle against imperialism and neocolonialism and for the achievement of progressive changes in the system of world economic relations and the organization of mutually profitable cooperation in the interests of all countries and peoples.

FOOTNOTES

2. "The Political Economy of Present-Day Monopoly Capitalism," Moscow, 1975, vol 2, p 367.
3. Thus in the period 1956-1972 approximately one-third of foreign assets which had arisen on the basis of direct investments was nationalized in 40 developing countries, according to available estimates (see T.Ya. Belous "International Monopolies and the Export of Capital," Moscow, 1982, p 140).
4. See UN Document E/C. 10/38. 20 March 1978, pp 233-234.
5. See for more detail I. Ivanov, "The Transnational Monopolies--Threat to Sovereignty" (MEMO No 1, 1978).
6. Estimated from "Manuel de statistiques du commerce international et du developpement. Supplement 1981." New York, 1982, pp 264-265.
7. UN Document E/C. 10/38. 20 March 1978, p 229.
8. "Towards the New International Economic Order. Analytical Report on Development in the Field of International Economic Cooperation Since the Sixth Special Session of the General Assembly," United Nations, New York, 1982, p 36.
9. "Strategy of the Socioeconomic Development of the Emerging Countries for the 1980's," Moscow, 1982, p 29; "Yearbook of National Accounts Statistics 1980," vol II, New York, 1982, pp 252-253.
10. Estimated from "Yearbook of National Accounts Statistics 1980," p 3.
11. Estimated from BULLETIN MENSUEL DE STATISTIQUE July 1982, Special Table B.
12. Between Kuwait on the one hand and Bhutan and Bangladesh on the other.
13. Estimated from "Cooperation pour le developpement. Examen 1981," OECD, Paris, 1981, pp 258-260.
14. "Development Cooperation, 1982 Review," OECD, Paris, 1982, pp 51, 235.
15. "Economic Position of the Capitalist and Developing Countries. Appendix to MEMO Journal". Survey for 1981 and Start of 1982, Moscow, 1982, p 31; "Cooperation pour le developpement. Examen 1981," p 241.
16. See "Cooperation pour le developpement. Examen 1981," pp 31-32, 36.
17. Estimated from BULLETIN MENSUEL DE STATISTIQUE May 1982; NAC/CONF. 7/Doc. 6/Rev. 3. 11 March 1983, pp 1, 5.
18. Ibid., July 1982.

19. "Cooperation pour le developpement. Examen 1981," p 15.
20. M.M. Maksimova, "The USSR and International Economic Cooperation," Moscow, 1977; E.Ye. Obminskiy, "International Economic Order Concepts," Moscow 1977; N.P. Shmelev, "Socialism and International Economic Relations," Moscow, 1979; I. Ivanov, "Reorganization of International Relations and Global Problems" (MEMO No 2, 1981).
21. UN Document A/34/542. 11 October 1979, p 100.
22. For more detail see L. Lyubimov, I. Gorev, "The Oceans: New Rule of Law in the Interests of Peace and Cooperation" (MEMO No 9, 1982).
23. Thus UN expert K. Sovan believes that a number of basic directions of the NIEO program (access to markets, trade liberalization, transfer of resources and technology, structural reorganization) merely lead to a further intensification of the structural heterogeneousness of the economy of the developing countries and an extension of their economic dependence. "Considering the underlying philosophy of the NIEO program and, in particular, the role which it assigns the TNC," he writes, "it is not a new and more just world economic order which is established on the basis of the NIEO program. It is more the old international order proclaimed and sanctified by the developing countries" ("International Trade, Industrialization and the New International Economic Order," New York, 1981, p 141).
24. The Economic Declaration of the Havana Nonaligned Conference rightly observes that the political essence of the movement for a NIEO consists of the democratization of international economic relations (UN Document A/34/542. 11 October 1979, p 105).

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1983.

8850

CSO: 1816/10

PRIMAKOV REVIEWS GROMYKO BOOK ON EXPORT OF CAPITAL

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 5,
May 83 pp 133-136

[Review by E. Primakov: "'The Empire of the Dollar' in the Past and Present" of the recent book by A.A. Gromyko: "Foreign Expansion of Capital: History and the Present Day", Moscow, "Mysl", 1982, passages between slantlines published in boldface]

[Text] A scientific analysis characterized by deep class content of the foreign policy of any state is inconceivable without studying the economic prerequisites which form its foundation, without investigating the influence of the economic processes which determine the "face" of a given society as a formation and, finally, without revealing the prevailing interests of the dominating class forces which foreign policy is designed to defend. The recent scientific work by Doctor of Economics A.A. Gromyko, one of the most prominent state figures of the Soviet Union, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, who has for almost 30 years on end stood at the head of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, is a vivid example of such methodological approach. This work which reveals the political and economic aspects of the global expansion of U.S. imperialism in their inseparable unity and dialectical interaction is not just and not only another monograph reflecting the scope of the author's scientific interests but also characterizes to a certain extent the laboratory of scientific approach which guides the foreign policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state.

It is not accidental either that A.A. Gromyko has chosen from the entire sum of economic phenomena and processes characteristic of the development of the capitalist society in the United States the problem of exporting capital which has also been the subject of previous works of his.* It is well known that V.I. Lenin regarded the export of capital as one of the main characteristic features of the highest and last stage of capitalism, namely imperialism.

* "Export of U.S. Capital. From the History of Exporting U.S. Capital as a Weapon of Economic and Political Expansion," Moscow, 1957; "the Expansion of the Dollar," Moscow, 1961 (published under the pseudonym G. Andreyev)".

The reviewed book is a result of the author's longstanding observations and deliberations on the subject of the economic and political process taking place in the United States--this "citadel" of contemporary state-monopolistic capitalism. The main subject of analysis in this broadly planned and thoroughly documented work in the international expansion of U.S. imperialism. Following the path of concretely characterizing the means and motive forces of this expansion, A.A. Gromyko investigates the dynamics and evolution of the forms in which monopolistic U.S. capital transcends national boundaries. In this context all the aspects of big U.S. enterprise abroad--economic and political, diplomatic and ideological, military and "peaceful"--are taken as one whole. It is precisely this approach which enabled the author to broaden the geographic and analytical framework and show the structural changes in the policy and economy of the entirety of world capitalism taken in the long term. The monograph treats the U.S. experience and U.S. material in comparison with those changes which are suffered by the competitors and partners of the United States in the course of capitalism's uneven development during the last century. This way of regarding problems in their historical perspective made it possible to carry out interesting typological comparisons of the main Western states and at the same time show imperialism and its reproduction as a complex dynamic whole.

The monograph uncovers the main specific features of U.S. imperialism which predetermined the formation of its expansionist policy. U.S. imperialism is characterized by the uneven process of gaining the leading positions in the capitalist world. Whereas in certain respects the U.S. economy surpassed that of its competitors as early as at the end of the 19th century, in others it could catch up with countries that were strong in military-political and financial respects as late as in the 20th century. In this connection it is significant that to a great extent the United States rose to become the leader of the capitalist world at a time when the military-industrial complex developed. A.A. Gromyko devotes great attention to investigating the influence which was exerted on very important political-economic processes such as the accumulation of financial capital and the dwindling role of production capital, changes in the correlation of forces in the imperialist camp, militarization of the economy, enhanced state-monopolistic tendencies in the United States and the transformation of Washington's international strategy.

The book attests that the entire evolution of the global expansion of U.S. banks, industrial concerns and trusts is inseparably connected with the history of world wars which sharply accelerated the accumulation of capital and the enrichment of U.S. monopolies. Relatively marginally involved in military operations and having suffered practically no direct material damage from military actions, the United States invariably played the part of a banker to its allies and that of a very big supplier of military and other types of equipment, technology of destruction, and means of militarization. Thus a powerful military-industrial complex was built which at the time specialized in export. The military-industrial complex occupied a very important place in the industrial structure of the U.S. economy and the military-industrial corporations, craving for big orders from the government and interested in consolidating the conditions suitable for the growing sales of products on

foreign markets, began to play an increasingly important role in shaping Washington's foreign policy course.

At the same time during the two world wars the U.S. allies and the defeated countries suffered direct destruction of their production capacities, and people of the most productive ages and qualified cadres of the working population either perished or were diverted away from production. These countries went through periods of serious obsolescence and physical ageing of their basic funds. Besides, huge military expenditures and the mobilization of national resources for the war needs led to a situation where economies which used to have surplus capital began to suffer from capital shortages and the former creditors became indebted.

As a result of all this already World War I and its direct and long-term consequences caused radical changes in the position which U.S. imperialism occupied in the world and provided it with a unique opportunity to gain strength under conditions when its main competitors were weakened. The book demonstrates how the indebtedness of the European states turned out to be a first-rate weapon to exert pressure on them, thus enabling monopolistic U.S. capital massively supported by the government to penetrate actively into foreign markets and accelerate the export of goods, technology and capital which immediately led to an unprecedented--even for the United States--increase in the volume of industrial production.

Of course to admit that during two world wars and the preparation for them U.S. imperialism developed most intensively by no means leads to the conclusion that the production forces of capitalism cannot develop under conditions when the arms race is renounced and military production reconverted. We are only talking of the fact that militarization and wars were and continue to be "stimulators" in the development of a concrete form of imperialism, namely U.S. imperialism.

Another substantial change connected with war was the fact that the negative U.S. balance of international investments turned into a positive one. What is more, during the years separating the two world wars U.S. international monopolies moved up into first place as regards the amount of exported capital. It is important to note that the monograph considers this question in the context of those quantitative and qualitative changes which the process of reproducing capital undergoes in the United States. Particular attention is devoted to the growing participation of the state in the above-mentioned process which is undoubtedly also reflected in the sharply enhanced role played by the state in the export of U.S. capital. This specific feature of the export of capital, which later substantially influenced the nature and scope of the foreign political expansion of the United States, finally took shape in the period between the two world wars. In the period 1919-1940 the total volume of U.S. capital exported abroad went up 3.5 times--from \$9.7 to \$34.3 billion of which almost three-fourths were state means.

At the same time the state and private-capitalist forms of exporting capital became more and more interconnected. Even in the first half of our century the method of stimulating growth and accumulation, as characteristic of U.S.

state-monopolistic capitalism was perfected. It can be visualized in the form of a chain consisting of state loans, the export which is tied to them, and the stimulation of the investment-production activity of corporations both at home and abroad. Later the same method was tried again, this time on a broader "firing range" which included not only the developed but primarily liberated countries.

As regards the immediate role of the United States, World War II repeated to a great extent the "scenario" of World War I although its scale and nature were different and there were changes in the United States itself. According to A.A. Gromyko from the point of view of the influence they exerted on the U.S. economy one of the main differences between World War I and World War II was the fact that direct state financing of new plants and factories sharply went up. During World War II the total expenditure for building new enterprises amounted to at least \$25 billion, two-thirds of which was accounted for by state financing. In comparison, during World War I the government financed approximately 10 percent of all the expenditures for building new and expanding old enterprises. On the whole the war provided the United States with a kind of "launching site" for a new round of its global expansion. During the war the foundation was laid for actively utilizing the state apparatus in the monopolistic struggle to acquire new foreign spheres for investing capital. The fact that in 1944 at the initiative of the Washington administration two of the biggest international monetary and credit organizations--IBRD and IMF--were formed where U.S. capital held dominating positions was a vivid proof of this statement.

Such substantial strengthening of state-monopolist tendencies during the war did not reflect the financial weakness of the private-monopolistic sector whose net profit (\$57 billion) was more than double the total expenditure for building new enterprises during the war. State-monopolistic tendencies also failed to weaken when after the end of the war the greater part of state property was sold at a reduced price to the biggest monopolies. It was only the functional interconnection between the two elements of state-monopolistic capitalism which had changed. By the way, it was precisely as a result of this change that the U.S. military-industrial complex was formed under the Pentagon's aegis. It was based on the monetary resources of the state budget and concentrated in the enterprises belonging to giant corporations.

After World War II, the process of leveling out the strength of the United States and that of its allies in the economic sphere set in despite the leading positions held by the United States in the capitalist world as regards the military-political sphere. Again this happened as a result of the uneven development of the various imperialist "centers of strength."

The data related to the period after World War II and particularly to the seventies very clearly attest to this. Thus, as regards the rate of growth of the gross national product in the period 1960-1980 the United States invariably lagged behind the EEC countries and Japan. The same was observed as regards the rate of the average annual growth in productivity (1970-1980), industrial growth (1967-1980) and so forth. It is a very typical and an unfavorable symptom for the United States that it is suffering a serious setback under the pressure of competition in the export of capital. In the total volume of capital exports from the developed Western countries the share of the United States has gone down in 15 years (1965-1979) from 69.8

to 51 percent. The tendencies mentioned above could not fail to negatively affect the competitive ability of U.S. exports as a whole. Indeed, in spite of the fact that goods exported from the United States on the whole receive a maximum government support in the financial, political and diplomatic respects as compared with the other exporting countries, in 1965-1981 the U.S. share in the world capitalist production dropped from 14.6 to 13 percent. In many cases U.S. producers are even incapable of opposing their competitors in their own market, and here we are talking of imports not only from developed but also from developing countries. Under the existing conditions big U.S. capital is supported more and more by the state mechanism and utilizes it in its own interests. Demanding and striving for protectionist measures the monopolies at the same time insist, referring to the principles of economic liberalism, that the other countries open their own markets as wide as possible for U.S. goods. However, this position is not very new. In the 19th century the previous "capitalist leader"--Great Britain--adhered to the same tactics when necessary.

It is very typical that while getting into difficulties as regards exporting goods U.S. imperialism again resorts to the classical--for the highest stage of capitalism--method, that is the export and sales of U.S. industrial production. In this connection forms such as creating transnational corporations through which the United States starts partially transferring its production sites to other countries, providing favorable conditions for investing and selling and where manpower is relatively cheap, these forms become particularly significant. It is also very significant that (and here the fact that war and its preparation are a boost for the U.S. economy manifests itself once again) the U.S. monopolies have built up an active export trade in a relatively narrow sector, namely in selling up-to-date military technology and products of related science and capital-intensive and technologically-complex branches. Let us note that it is precisely in this segment of the economy that the budgetary-financial, organizational and scientific assistance of the state was the greatest, whereas factors dictated by the market and competition were reduced to a minimum.

The most significant changes in the export of U.S. capital can be traced on the basis of A.A. Gromyko's analysis of the structure and dynamics of the direct/ investments in the post-war period, investments which secure control. This component of the U.S. foreign investments is all the more important because, first, it dominates in the overall amount of exported private capital and, second, by the early eighties this form of monopolistic expansion for the first time in the last 60 years quantitatively equalled the foreign financial operations of the state. However, this by no means signifies that the state element in the foreign activity of U.S. state-monopolistic capitalism has weakened. Rather, we are talking of the new forms of activity of U.S. monopolistic capital beyond U.S. boundaries which is made possible and supported by state intervention.

The changes in the direction of exporting U.S. capital traced by the author call for attention. The data for 1950-1981 demonstrates that the share of U.S. investment in developed capitalist countries sharply went up (from 48.3 to 73.5 percent), whereas the share of investing in the developing world shrank (from 48.7 down to 24.7 percent).

These qualitative changes took place as a result of the further internationalization of trade in the world capitalist economy which is developing particularly fast at its center. In this connection the most important aspect of this process is the expansion of U.S. monopolistic capital. At the same time it seems that it is absolutely unjustified to speak of the loss of interest on the part of U.S. monopolistic capital in the fringes of the world capitalist economy, that is in the former colonies and semicolonies. In absolute figures the export of private U.S. capital to the liberated world is growing and growing quite considerably.

It is also important to note one more specific feature in the export of U.S. capital under the present historical conditions. In fact, the peak of the global expansion of U.S. monopolies and the imperial pretensions of the United States were reached in a phase of a general crisis of capitalism when due to the growth of real socialism the conditions for the self-accumulation of capital suffered deep and irrevocable deformations. Basing himself on a known statement by K. Marx, A.A. Gromyko characterizes the general situation in which state-monopolistic capitalism is functioning at the present stage in the following way: "The crisis has also engulfed the very foundation of this last system of exploitation: capitalism as a system of social production, or /secondary/, /tertiary/ and generally /derivative and transposed/ nonprimary production relations--which manifest themselves in the international sphere."

The fact that the general crisis of capitalism coincided in time with U.S. imperialism emerging in the position of the leader of the capitalist system deeply affected the nature and even the style of behavior of U.S. big business and the ruling class. The imperial claims of Washington's ruling circles and the global expansion of the U.S. international monopolies are now the most serious and dangerous factor in destabilizing world intergovernmental relations, forcing the socialist countries to undertake particular measures to guarantee their own security and sovereignty.

The CPSU Central Committee accountability report to the 25th party congress laconically but concisely characterized the most important specific features of the present situation in the developed capitalist countries and evaluated the most significant crisis phenomena and their consequences in the structure and international relations of state-monopolistic capitalism: "The sphere of the imperialist world domination has narrowed, the internal contradictions in the capitalist countries and the rivalry between them have exacerbated. The aggressiveness of the imperialist policy and, first and foremost, of the policy of U.S. imperialism has been sharply enhanced.... The struggle around the main questions of the foreign political course of the capitalist countries has intensified. In recent time the opponents of detente, of limiting the arms race and improving relations with the Soviet Union have notably intensified their activity." In such a situation the task of thoroughly studying the evolutions experienced by the developed capitalist states in the sphere of internal reproduction and foreign economic and foreign political relations--both among themselves and with other socialist and developing countries--becomes particularly topical. The new book by A.A. Gromyko is an important step forward in implementing this important scientific and political task.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1983.

BAGRAMOV BOOK ON NATIONALISM REVIEWED

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 5,
pp 137-138

[A. Kholmogorov book* review: "Marxism-Leninism and National Relations"]

[Text] In its struggle against the socialist world international imperialism is putting its main hopes in bourgeois nationalism, regarding it as "the most powerful destructive force of the 20th century" and a kind of "almighty virus" which knows no social and geographical frontiers. A leading place among the main directions of present-day anticommunism and anti-Sovietism belongs to a variety of attacks on the theory and practice of proletarian, socialist internationalism. They invariably intensify in line with the successful solution of the national question in the Soviet Union and the other socialist community countries.

Many works by Soviet social scientists are devoted to the contrast of the two concepts in the national question. The monograph in question is a kind of summation of the author's many years of research into this set of problems, which are not only of theoretical but also practical, political significance.

Emphasizing that under current conditions "the significance of the struggle of the two world views in national relations is greater than ever before,"

F. Bagramev concludes that "a number of new aspects of the theory and practice of proletarian internationalism and bourgeois nationalism" requires a fundamental ideological-theoretical analysis (p 4).

The book systematizes the basic conceptual directions and ideological constructions of a nationalist interpretation and cogently exposes from Marxist-Leninist standpoints their pseudoscientific, reactionary nature and attempts "to analyze certain actual problems and concepts in the sphere of national relations around which a struggle of ideas is under way in the modern world" (ibid.).

Viewing the phenomenon of nationalism as a concrete-historical occurrence, the author observes that its modern proponents, as distinct from the representatives of bestial racism, no longer appeal to race and bloodtype but veil themselves of modern "psychological language". The entire point of the theoretical postulates of bourgeois ideologists is that nationalism is an

* A. Kholmogorov "Natsional'nyy vopros v bor'be idey" [The National Question in the Struggle of Ideas], Moscow, Izdatel'stvo politicheskoy literatury, 1982, p 316.

ineradicable property of the human psyche. This is asserted by, for example, the American sociologist B. Schaefer in his book "Aspects of Nationalism".

E. Bagramov reveals the scientific groundlessness of such views. "Bourgeois ideologists hope," he writes, "that in speculating on the tenacity of national traditions in the mass consciousness and exaggerating national differences in every possible way they will be able to combat the ideas of proletarian internationalism and prevent the unity of the peoples in the struggle for social progress" (pp 56-57). As the work shows, Western sociologists equate the "national" and "nationalist" concepts. They also define the nation from nationalist standpoints. Following the father of the idealistic theory of the nation, Otto Bauer, they adhere entirely to the standpoints of psychologization and mystification of the nation. Thus W. Connor believes that the initial principle of the nation is "subjective and consists of people's recognition within the framework of a certain group of a community of their past and present and--what is most important--their destiny." "Nations are mystical communities," the American political scientist R. Barnet echoes him (p 31).

The Marxist-Leninist viewpoint of the national in all its manifestations proceeds from the fact that it represents an "inimitable combination of the natural and social living conditions of a historical community of people (ethnic group, nation) and the totality of the material, cultural and spiritual values which it has created and also the spiritual values of other peoples assimilated by this community" (p 29).

While in no way denying the national distinctiveness of this people or the other Marxism-Leninism opposes a one-sided approach to an understanding of this phenomenon, which inevitably leads to the propagation of the exclusiveness of individual nations, the blunting of the antagonism of the classes and attempts to establish the illusion of the "uniform" thoughts and aspirations and the "single" world outlook of the representatives of a given nation and its special "national spirit".

At the same time the author takes account of the reality of national specifics. "The representatives of this nation or the other," we read in the book, "express thoughts and feelings typical of all of us in their own way" and are characterized "in each given period by certain typical nuances in the perception of this thing or phenomenon or the other and a certain way of reacting to them, in a word, everything that imparts a certain coloring and specific nature to the spiritual activeness of the representatives of a nation and to national culture" (p 85).

From racist positions bourgeois ideologists divide civilization and culture into "oriental" and "occidental" and would have people believe that, by virtue of racial singularities, oriental peoples are incapable of perceiving and developing modern civilization. Some of them ignore the interpenetration of cultures, which constitutes an important factor of the progress of human civilization, regard world history as the sum total of local civilizations, absolutize the individual and underestimate the general, which is of world-historic significance. Others, on the other hand, preach cosmopolitan ideas of the "unification" of the cultures of the peoples in the Western manner, the

erasure of their national features and singularities and the adaptation of the peoples to the "norms" of Western development. Yet others propagandize the proposition of the "denationalization" of art as a "supranational" phenomenon and call for the study not of real national art as an inalienable part of the world cultural-aesthetic process but its study as a "supranational" phenomenon contributing merely to West European art.

The author of the book in question rightly asserts that the mutual influence and interconnection of national cultures is an essential condition of the development of world culture. The more intensive the cultural exchange between peoples, the richer and more diverse general culture becomes. "Uniform in his biological nature," E. Bagramov emphasizes, "and, what is most important, subordinate to the general laws of social development, man in a cultural respect also represents a unity, which is revealed increasingly strongly as the international intercourse and relations of the peoples develop" (p 68).

The author emphasizes that proletarian internationalism as the ideology and policy of the working class in national relations is irreconcilable with any nationalism, even the most refined and "pure". Marxism, as V.I. Lenin pointed out, puts in the place of any nationalism internationalism and the merger of all nations in the highest unity.

The final section of the work is devoted to a demonstration of the triumph of internationalism in socialist society against the background of the exacerbation of national relations in the capitalist world. The realization of Lenin's principles of national policy in practice signified the creation in our country of a powerful state--the USSR. Its formation, as Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, observed, "was not only a major step forward in the development of socialism but also a most important turning point in the course of world history."* In the USSR, thanks to the real qualitative changes which have occurred in national relations in 60 years, "the national question in the form in which it was bequeathed us by the exploiter system has been successfully solved and solved conclusively and irrevocably.** Other socialist community countries have scored big successes in the implementation of national policy.

In the capitalist states the national question is a most acute internal political problem largely determining the sociopolitical climate. In Britain the Irish question is exacerbated in the extreme, in Belgium so is the Flemish-Walloon issue and in Canada the Anglo-Canadian and French-Canadian questions. A whole "bouquet" of racial-national questions has taken shape in the United States: Negro, Mexican, Indian. It is well known that the process of consolidation of the American bourgeois nation which began back in the 18th century has yet to be completed even today. This is impeded by the ideology and policy of racism and chauvinism implanted by the exploiter classes.

The successes of the implementation of Lenin's national policy in the socialist world, particularly in the USSR, have brought about the unprecedented

* Yu.V. Andropov, "Sixty Years of the USSR," Moscow, 1982, p 6.

** Ibid., p 9.

assertiveness of the bourgeois falsifiers. They not only deny the solution of the national question in the Soviet Union but also hysterically prophesy its "exacerbation" in the future. Among the merits of the work we should mention the serious critical analysis of the pseudoscientific "works" of numerous ideologists of modern nationalism who maliciously distort the CPSU's Leninist national policy and the development of national relations in the USSR and the other socialist community countries.

Written in clear, emotional language and at the same time on a high theoretical level, the monograph in question is distinguished by thoroughness of content and the abundance of new factual material that has been put in scientific circulation. The readers have acquired a needed and interesting book.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1983.

8850

CSO: 1816/10

-END-

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

August 29, 1983